CONSIDERATIONS
ON THE
COUNCIL
OF
TRENT:
BEING THE
Fifth DISCOURSE,
Concerning the
GUIDE
IN
CONTROVERSIES.

By *R. H.*

S. MARGARET'S CONVENT EDINBURGH

1 Pet. 3. 15. —— *Parati ſemper ad ſatisfactionem omni poſcenti vos Rationem.*
2 Cor. 6. 8. —— *Per infamiam, & bonam famam; Ut ſeductores, & Veraces.*

LONDON,
Printed for *W. C.* and are to be Sold by *Matthew Turner*, at the *Lamb* in *High-Holbourn.* MDCLXXXVII.

UMI

THE PREFACE.

IN the former *Diſcourſes* concerning the *Guide in Controverſies*, as alſo, in the Beginning and Concluſion of this preſent, I have endeavoured to perſwade a neceſſity of *Obedience* to a lawful *Church-Authority* from theſe weighty Conſiderations, whereon ſeem to be built the *Unity*, and the *Peace* of *Chriſtian* Religion. 1. Firſt, That, However the *Holy Scriptures* are a Rule *ſufficient*; yet not, in reſpect of all capacities, a Rule ſo *clear*, but that the *true ſenſe* of them is by ſeveral Parties much diſputed; and that in points of Faith *neceſſary* to be known; And therefore, as to theſe, need of ſome other Guide for the direction of Chriſtians in this true Senſe. 2. That there is contained in theſe Scriptures a Divine *Promiſe*, and that not Conditional, but *Abſolute*, of *Indefectibility*, or not erring in Neceſſaries, made to the *Church-Catholick* of all Ages: To It, not only *Diffuſive*, (ſome or other, Perſons, or Churches, always not to err in neceſſaries;) but, as a *Guide*; or, to the Guides thereof. 3. Again; That the *Catholick Church* throughout the whole World is but *One*, ever contradiſtinct to all other Communions *Heretical*, or *Schiſmatical*: And, its *Governors* and Clergy, however diſperſed through ſeveral Nations, regulated by the ſame *Laws*; and ſtraitly linked together in a due *ſubordination*; whereby the *Inferiors* are ſubjected to the *Superiors*, and a *Part* to the *Whole*, in ſuch manner; as that theſe Laws, obſerved, admit of, or conſiſt with, no *Schiſms*, Diviſions, or contradicting Parties,

after any past *Declarations* of the *Church*. 4. That, in this Subordination, no *inferior* Clergy (*Person*, *Church*, or *Council*,) when ſtanding in any oppoſition to their *Superiors*, can be this *Guide* to Chriſtians: But only the Superior, whether Perſon, or Council: and, in a *Council* not wholly unanimous, the *major Part*, join'd with the *See Apoſtolick*. *The major Part*; whether thoſe *preſent* in the Council, and decreeing matters in debate, or thoſe *abſent*, and accepting their Decrees: A regular obedience, in any contradiction, thus aſcending to, and acquieſcing in, the *ſentence* of the moſt *ſupreme* in preſent actual being. That alſo, theſe *ſubordinations* of *Church-Governors* are ſo commonly known; and by the learned on all ſides acknowledged, that even a *Plebeian*, following this line, though amidſt ſo many *Sects* calling him hither, and thither, and all offering to ſhew him the right way, cannot miſtake his true *Guide*. 5. That, from this *preſent Guide* thus diſcovered, All are to learn, both as to the true *ſenſe* of *Holy Scriptures*; and, of *Antiquity*, or former *Church Tradition*, and alſo the *legalneſs* of former *Councils*, &c. (when any of theſe are controverted and queſtioned,) the *Reſolution* of that, which they ought to believe, and adhere to, ſo far as its *Determinations* have preſcribed to their *Faith*. And, the more important any point is, that they are hence the more ſtrictly obliged to the Declarations of this Authority, becauſe here more danger in their miſtake. That here; if we grant an *Infallibility* of this Guide in *Neceſſaries* (which is amply proved) this bindeth its Subjects to an *univerſal* acceptance of its *Decrees*, leſt, perhaps in ſome *Neceſſary*, their Faith ſhould miſcarry. Or, this Guide ſuppoſed *Fallible*, (which preſuppoſeth in ſuch matters ſome obſcurity in the *Rule*) yet neither thus, are the bonds of their *obedience* any way relaxed, ſince their own fallibility is much greater: And if, in following ſuch a learned and prudent Conduct, they are expoſed to ſome *error*, yet ſo, to much more, and more groſs, by following their own. Of the miſchief of which *Self-conduct* the many modern, moſt abſurd *Sects*, and eſpecially the *Socinians*, are a dreadful Example. Who very inquiſitive, and laborious, and critical, as to the *Holy Scriptures*, yet, by throwing off the yoke of a legal *Church-Authority*, are, by the Divine juſt Judgment, delivered up to moſt *Capital*, and *Deſperate* errors, and thoſe running through the whole Body of *Divinity*. 6. That none, in the reſiſtance of *Authority*, can be

be ſecured by following his *Conſcience*, (though always obliged to follow it,) when It, *culpably*, miſguiding him; and in the information whereof he hath not uſed neceſſary diligence. 7. That, where ſuch a weighty *Church-Authority* (I ſpeak of the moſt *ſupreme*, to which the Church's Subjects may apply themſelves) ſo highly authorized, and recommended to us by our *Lord*, ſways on the one ſide, and only *Arguments* and *Reaſons*, relating to the matter in Agitation, but all theſe ſhort of *certainty*, on the other, here a ſober and diſintereſſed Judgment cannot but paſs ſentence; that it is ſafer to ſubmit to the *firſt* of theſe, than to rely on the *ſecond*. And then; ſo often, the following our *reaſons* and private opinion, and deſerting *Authority*, becomes acting againſt our *Judgment* and *Conſcience*, and the forſaking our private Reaſon, acting according to it. 8. That thus; at leaſt, all thoſe, who have a contrary perſwaſion to Authority, but *ſhort* of *certainty*; (*i. e.* all *illiterate*, and Plebeians, unable to examine Controverſies; or alſo *learned*, that, after examining them, are left ſtill in ſome doubt, which two ſorts will comprehend the moſt Chriſtians) are engaged, in *Conſcience*, to yield their *aſſent* to the *Deciſions* of this Authority. 9. That an *abſolute* and *Demonſtrative* Certainty indeed, where-ever it is, is exempted from all ſuch obedience to Authority, as ſhall require ſubmiſſion of *Judgment*, and *Aſſent*: But, that ſuch a *Certainty* is very difficultly attained, in matters *Intellectual*, and abſtracted from ſenſe; more difficultly yet, in thoſe *Spiritual*, and *Divine*; eſpecially, ſuch Divine and Spiritual matters, where *Church-Authority*, *i.e.* ſo numerous a Body of *learned* and *prudent* men, diſcern little reaſon for what we pretend Certainty of, and ſo much againſt it, as that they declare the *contrary* for *certain*. To which may be added the frequent experience of our own weakneſs, when, by more ſtudy, and better weighing, and comparing *contrary* Reaſons, we come to *doubt* of the truth of ſeveral things, wherein, formerly, we thought our ſelves moſt fully ſatisfied. 10. That, ſuppoſing ſuch a *Certainty* attained; and ſo obedience of *Aſſent* juſtly repealed; yet, if this be of a *Truth* of no *great importance* or conſequence (of which *great* importance too, as well as of the truth it ſelf, they are to be *certain*,) here ſtill, another *Obedience*, *viz.* that of *ſilence*, or Non-contradiction, tyes us faſt, and reſts ſtill due, and payable to *Church-Authority*: And ſo, theſe *Certainiſts*, or *Demonſtrators*, become, at leaſt, tongue-tied, and conſtrained to ſtand *ſingle*; and

diſin-

disinabled to father, or beget, *Sects.* 11. Or, in the last place, if this also Certain, that it is a *Truth* of *great* concernment, and the *Error* of the Church-Guides therein not only manifest, but *Intolerable*, and so they are here obliged also, to break this second obedience, silence, and publish such truth: yet remain they still fettered with the Bonds of a third *Obedience*; I mean *Passive*, in a meek submittance to the *Church's Censures*. And, if they shall happen to be *excommunicated* by the *Church*, and externally disjoined from its Society, yet is it by no means lawful for them, after their publishing *new Doctrines*, to proceed also to erect a *new Altar*, or Anti-Communion, against it: But, patiently undergoing its sentence, and longing for their peaceable restorement to the former *Catholick* Communion (which is always but *One*, and may not be divided,) they are to expect, from God, the vindication, of his *Truth*; and their *Innocence*: Which so long as any suffers for, he remains still *internally* a member of this former *Society*, from which *externally* he is excluded. Now, by this third *Obedience*, if the Church's *Faith* in some manner suffers, yet its *Unity* at least will remain unviolated, and not divided, or torn, by Schisms. These things I have endeavoured to represent, and perswade to the pious Reader in the former *Discourses*; as also, in the beginning and conclusion of this present Work, have further pressed them. Now, from such a submission to a *legal* Church-Authority once gained, the same is rightly demanded to that of *Trent*, if this *Council* proved *Legal*: And then, by this Council, once received and submitted to, is an end put to the most, and chiefest, of the *modern* Theological *Controversies*, and present Church-distractions. This, then, is the Task of the following Discourse: Of which I implore the *Divine Majesty* for a *prosperous* success, only so far, as it maintains a *right*, and just, Cause; and so commit the *Reader* to the gracious Illuminations of his *Holy Spirit*.

THE

THE CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

Proteſtant-*Objections againſt this* Council.

OBjected *by* Proteſtants,
1. *That the* Council *of* Trent *was not a* General Council, §. 3.
2. *That, not* Patriarchal, §. 4.
3. *That, not Free and Legal, in its Proceedings*, §. 5.
4. *That, Several of its Deciſions are without, or contrary to, Scripture, or Primitive Tradition; and Tyrannically Impoſed*, §. 6.
5. *That the Decrees of this* Council *touching* Reformation *were meerly Deluſory*, §. 6. n. 2.

CHAP. II.

Some General Conſiderations pre-poſed.

1. *Of Inferior Councils.*

The due ſubordination, and other Regulations, of them, §. 9.
1. *The ſeveral Councils, at leaſt ſo high as the* Patriarchal, *to be called, and moderated, by their reſpective Eccleſiaſtical Superiors, or Preſidents; and nothing to be paſſed by them, without his, or by Him without their, conſent*, §. 10.
2. *No Introduction, or Ordination, of Inferior* Clergy *to be made without Approbation, or Confirmation of the Superior*, §. 11.
3. *Differences between Inferiors, upon Appeal to be decided by Superiors; and thoſe of higher perſons, and in greater Cauſes, by the* Biſhop *of the* firſt *See*, §. 12. *(where concerning his conteſt, about this, with the* Africans, §. 13. n. 2. *)*
Yet; that no perſons, or Synods, co-ordinate might uſurp Authority, one over another: Nor all Cauſes aſcend to the Higheſt Courts; and, many, without troubling the Synod, in its Interval, to be decided by its Preſident, §. 14.
4. *Obedience, in any diſſent happening amongſt Superiors, to be yielded to the Superior of them.*
The Conceſſions of Learned Proteſtants, *touching the Precedents*, §. 16.
5. *no Addreſſes, or Appeals, permitted, from the Superior Eccleſiaſtical, to any ſecular, Judge, or Court*, §. 20.

Where,

The CONTENTS.

Where, That the Church, *from the beginning, was constituted a distinct Body from the* Civil State, §. 21.
And, what seem to be her Rights and Priviledges, (*as so distinct,*) §. 22.

CHAP. III.

2. *Of Councils General.*

1. *The necessary Composition of them, considered with relation to the Acceptation of them by Absents,* §. 35.
This Acceptation in what measure requisite, §. 39.
2. *To whom belongs the Presidentship in these Councils,* §. 45.
3. *And Calling of them,* §. 47.

CHAP. IV.

I. Head. *Of the Generality, and just Authority of the* Council *of* Trent.

1. *That the* Western *Churches, and particularly, that of* England, *are not free from the subjection to this* Council, *though it were not* General; *if* Patriarchal, §. 53.
2. *Or, if only so General, as those times were capable of,* §. 65.
3. *That it is not hindred from being General, by reason of the absence of the* Greek *Churches,* §. 66.
4. *Nor by reason of the absence of the* Protestant-Clergy, §. 67.

CHAP. V.

5. *That this Council is not hindred from being General, by the absence of the* Roman Catholick *Bishops of some Province, or Nation,* §. 69.
Where,
1. *Of the reason of the Paucity of* Bishops *in some Sessions,* §. 70.
2. *Of the Ratification of the Acts of those* Sessions *by the fuller Council under* Pius, §. 75.
3. *Of the Acceptation of the whole* Council *by the absent Prelacy,* §. 77. *And particularly: Concerning the Acceptation thereof by the French Church,* Ibid.

CHAP. VI.

6. *That the Generality of this Council is not prejudiced, by its being called by the* Pope, §. 80.
7. *Nor by reason of,*
1. *The pretended Non-generality of the Summons,* §. 82.
2. *Or, Non-freedom of the Place,* §. 83.
3. *Or, the want of Safe-Conduct,* §. 92.
Where, concerning the Doctrine imputed to the Roman *Church,* That Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks, §. 93. *And of the practice of the* Council *of* Constance, §. 101.

CHAP.

The CONTENTS.

CHAP. VII.

8. *That this Council is not rendred illegal, by the* Oath *of* Bishops *taken to the* Pope, §105.
9. *Nor yet by the* Bishop's, *or* Pope's, *being a Party, and Judges in their own Cause,* §. 113.
1. *Not by the* Bishops *their being Judges,* Ibid.
Where,
Of several ways of judging Ecclesiastical Controversies, justly rejected, §. 118.
2. *Nor by the* Pope's *being Judge,* §. 122.

CHAP. VIII.

II. Head. *The Invalidity of such a* Council, *as* Protestants *demanded.*

The Protestant-*Demands,* §. 127.
The unreasonableness of these Demands, §. 132.
Where,
Of the fruitlesness of many Diets *(framed according to* Protestant-*Proposals) to decide their Controversies.*

CHAP. IX.

III. Head. *Of the Legalness of the proceeding of this Council.*

1. *That a Council may be Legal, and Obligatory, in some of its Acts, when not in others,* §. 127.
2. *That no Decree concerning* Faith *was passed in this Council, where any considerable party contradicted,* §. 128.
3. *That there was no need of using any violence upon this Council for the condemning of the* Protestant-*Opinions; in condemning which, the Fathers of this Council unanimously agreed,* §. 150.
4. *That no violence was used upon the Council, for defining of Points debated between the* Catholicks *themselves,* §. 152.
Where,
Of the Councils proceedings, touching the chief points in debate.
Touching, 1. *Episcopal Residency,* Jure Divino, §. 153.
2. *Episcopal Jurisdiction,* Jure Divino, §. 154.
3. *The* Pope's *Superiority to Councils,* §. 155.
That these three Points of Controversie, however stated, are of no great advantage to the Reformed, §. 156.
5. *That no violence was used upon the Council, for hindring any just Reformations.*

The CONTENTS.

CHAP. X.

6. *That no violence was inferred upon the liberty of the Council, as to the disining any thing therein, contary to the General Approbation,*

By,

1. *The* Pope's *Legats propoſing the things to be handled there,* §. 166.
2. *The Conſultation made, in every thing, with the* Pope, §. 164.
3. *The exceſſive number of* Italian Biſhops, §. 167. *And, the not voting, by Nations, but by the Preſent Prelates,* §. 169.
4. *The* Pope's *giving Penſions,* §. 170.
5. *And admitting Titular* Biſhops, §. 171.
6. *The Prohibition of Biſhops Proxies to give Definitive votes,* §. 172.

CHAP. XI.

IV. Head. *Of the* Council's *many Definitions and Anathema's,*

1. *That all Anathema's are not inflicted, for holding ſomething againſt Faith,* §. 173.
2. *That matters of Faith have a great latitude: and ſo conſequently, the errors, that oppoſe Faith, and, are liable to be Anathematized,* §. 175.

Where,

Of the ſeveral ways, wherein things are ſaid to be of Faith, §. 176.

3. *That all* General Councils *to the worlds end have equal Authority in defining matters of* Faith: *And, by the more Definitions, the Chriſtian Faith is ſtill more perfected,* §. 177.

Where,

Of the true meaning of the Epheſin *Canon, reſtraining Additions to the Faith,* §. 178.

4. *That the* Council *of* Trent *prudently abſtained from the determining of many Controverſies, moved there,* §. 184.
5. *That the* Lutheran's *many erroneous opinions in matters of Faith engaged the* Council *to ſo many contrary Definitions,* §. 185.
6. *That all the Anathema's of this Council extend not to meer Diſſenters,* §. 186.
7. *That this Council, in her Definitions, decreed no new divine Truth, or new matter of Faith, which was not formerly ſuch, at leaſt in its neceſſary Principles.*

Where,

In what ſenſe Councils may be ſaid to make new Articles of Faith, and in what, not, §. 192.

8. *That the chief* Proteſtant-*Controverſies, defined in this Council of* Trent, *were ſo in former Councils,* §. 198.
9. *That the* Proteſtant-*Churches have made new Counter-Definitions, as particular as the* Roman; *and obliged their Subjects to believe, and ſubſcribe them,* §. 199.

10. *That*

10. *That a diſceſſion from the* Church, *and declaration againſt its Doctrines, was made by* Proteſtants, *before they were any way ſtraitned, or provoked, by the* Trent-*Decrees, or* Pius *his* Creed, §. 202.

CHAP. XII.

V. Head. *Of the Decrees of this Council concerning* Reformation.

1. *In matters, concerning the* Pope *and Court of* Rome.
   1. *Appeals*, §. 212. *and Diſpenſations*, §. 215. 2. *Collation of Benefices*, §. 218. 3. *Penſions*, §. 218. *Commenda's*, §. 219. *and uniting of Benefices*, §. 220. 4. *Exemptions*, §. 221. 5. *Abuſes concerning Indulgences, and Charities given to pious uſes*, §. 223.
2. *In matters concerning the* Clergy.
   1. *Unfit perſons many times admitted into Holy* Orders, *and Benefices*, §. 225. 2. *Pluralities*, §. 232. 3. *Non Reſidence*, §. 235. 4. *Neglect of Preaching*, §. 236. *n.* 2. 5. *Their reſtraint from Marriage*; *and Incontinency in* Celibacy, §. 238, 239. 6. *Their with-holding from the people the Communion of the* Cup, §. 241. 7. *Too frequent uſe of* Excommunication, §. 243. *n.* 1. 8. *The many diſorders in* Regulars *and* Monaſticks, §. 243. *n.* 2. 9. *Several defects in the* Miſſals, *and* Breviaries, §. 243. *n.* 3.

CHAP. XIII.

Solutions of the Proteſtant-*Objections.*

Brief Anſwers to the Proteſtant-*Objections, made before*, §. 3, &c.——§. 247, &c.
Where,
Of the Council's *joining Apoſtolical Tradition with the Holy Scripture as a Ground of Church-Definitions*, §. 264.

CHAP. XIV.

Conſiderations concerning a Limited Obedience to Church-Authority.

1. *Of the pretence of following* Conſcience *againſt* Church-Authority.

Two Defences againſt obeying, or yielding aſſent to, Church-Authority, §. 271.
1. *The neceſſity of following our Conſcience.*
2. *The certainty of a Truth, that is oppoſed by the Church.*
Reply to the firſt,
That following our Conſcience, when miſ-informed, excuſeth not from fault, §. 272.
Three ways, whereby the Will uſually corrupts the Judgment or Conſcience, and miſleads it, as it pleaſeth, in matters of Religion.

The CONTENTS.

1. *Diverting the Intellect to other employments, and not permitting it at all to ſtudy and examine, matters of Religion,* §. 274.
2. *Permitting an inquiry, or ſearch, into matters of Religion: but this not impartial, and univerſal,* §. 275.
3. *Admitting a free, and univerſal, ſearch as to other points controverted in Religion, but not as to that of* Church-Authority, §. 277.

Where,

That the Judgment may, and often doth, oblige men to go againſt their own Opinions, and ſeeming Reaſon, §. 278.

CHAP. XV.

Conſiderations,

For remedying the firſt Deceit, §. 281.

Where,

Whether Salvation may be had in any Chriſtian Profeſſion, retaining the Fundamentals of Faith, §. 282.

For remedying the ſecond Deceit, §. 289.

Where; *That perſons, not wholy reſigned to* Church-Authority, *ought to be very jealous of their preſent opinions: and indifferent, as Reaſons may move, to change their Religion,* Ibid.

For remedying the third, §. 291.

Where,

1. *That the Illiterate, or other perſons unſatisfied, ought to ſubmit, and adhere, to* Church-Authority, §. 294.
   That apparent miſchiefs follow the Contrary, §. 296.
2. *That, in preſent Church-Governors divided, and guided a contrary way, ſuch perſons ought to adhere to the Superiors, and thoſe, who by their Authority conclude the whole,* §. 298.
3. *As for Church-Authority paſt, ſuch perſons to take the teſtimony, concerning it, of the* Church-Authority *preſent,* §. 301.
   Yet, That it may be eaſily diſcerned by the Modern Writings, what preſent Churches moſt diſſent from the Primitive, §. 302.
   Where; of the aſperſion of Antiquity *with* Antichriſtianiſm, §. 311.

CHAP. XVI.

2. *Of the pretence of* Certainty, *againſt* Church-Authority.

Reply to the 2d *Defence, The pretended certainty of a Truth, againſt Church-Authority,* §. 318.

1. *That it is a very difficult thing to arrive to a rational, and demonſtrative certainty, in matters intellectual; more, in matters Divine, and Spiritual; and eſpecially, in ſuch Divine matters, where Church-Authority delivers the contrary for certain Truth,* Ibid.

Inſtances

The CONTENTS.

Instances made in four principal Points of modern Controversie: For which Church-Authority *is, by many Protestants, charged with Idolatry, and Sacrilege*, §. 320.

1. *The* Corporal Presence, *and consequently* Adoration, *of Christ's Body and Blood in the Eucharist*, §. 321.

A DIGRESSION.

Reflecting on the Opinion of the Greek, *and other* Oriental *Churches, holding a* Real Presence *of our Lord's Body and Blood (whether by* Transubstantiation, *or not): much mis-represented by Mr.* Claude, *a* French *Minister*, §. 321.

Whose various Artifices are detected, in,

* *Insinuating the* Greek's *Ignorance, Poverty, Imbecility; the* Latin's *Power, Missions, Industry, to gain them*, n. 1, 2, 3, 4.

* *Wresting the* Greek's *sayings to the* Protestant's *sense, contrary to their plain expressions.*

* *Affirming the* Greeks *to retain their former Church-Doctrine as high as* Damascen, *or* Gregory Nyssen; *yet not freely declaring the ancient and modern* Greeks *to differ from, or agree with, the* Protestant *opinion*, n. 5.

* *Waving the main Point*, viz. Real Presence (*which infers a Soveraign* Adoration); *contending about* Transubstantiation, *and that as an Article of Faith*, n. 6.

* *Barring all Testimonies, save such as press* Transubstantiation.

* *Using the term* Vertue *unreasonably, (as excluding Substance); and thereby making the* Greek *opinion contradictory, absurd and indefensible, and then leaving them to make it good: whereas he ought to have confessed their holding a* Presence *as well in* Substance, *as in* Vertue, n. 7, 8.

* *Shifting all Testimonies against him by disingenuously requiring testimony upon testimony, or by personal exceptions taken against them*, n. 9.

The Greek *Opinion concerning* Transubstantiation, *if made good, how prejudicial to the* Protestant's *Cause*, n. 10.

1. *Concerning* Transubstantiation.

Mr. Claude, *in receding from the* Latins, *makes the* Greeks *fall short of their own Similitude and usual Expressions, in three Particulars*, n. 13, &c.

That Vertue *may be taken as well argumentatively, adding to* Substance, *as diminutively, excluding it*, n. 14.

The Common Doctrine of the Greeks *carrying further than their Simile, to a Total* Transubstantiation, *Proved,*

1. *From their holding the same numerical Body of our Lord, born and crucified, to be exhibited in the Eucharist: present, not by descending from Heaven, but by a conversion of the Elements, and by a multiplication of its local existence in more places, than before*, n. 15, 16.

2. *From holding the Body thus present by Consecration to be Incorruptible, and its Incorruption to depend on its Resurrection, and so to relate to that numerical Body crucified and raised again. Now, the Bread,* remain-

remaining intire for its ſubſtance, or its matter and qualities, cannot be ſuch a Body of our Lord as ſuffers no digeſtion, or corruption. Yet ſomething in the Sacrament ſuffers this. For the Greeks *then (whilſt holding the* Subſtance *of Bread to remain) to lay theſe changes only on the* Accidents, *not the* Subſtance *(eating bread, fed only by the accidents) were without a* Tranſubſtatiation *to eſpouſe the difficulties of it; and therefore their opinion implies an [illegible]e change of the Bread, as well its matter, as form*, n. 17.

3. *From holding this Body in the Euchariſt*, whenever broken whole and entire in each piece, —— to all diſtributed, no way diminiſhed. —— The Lamb broken, not impaired, ever eaten, yet not conſumed. *Which things cannot be ſaid of our Lord's Body, if the matter of bread ſtill remaineth*, n. 18.

Whereas Greeks *and* Latins, *former and later times may be accorded, this Author, to maintain the variance, ſeems to faſten on the* Greeks, *an opinion leſs eligible than* Tranſubſtantiation, *and to offer violence to the natural ſenſe of their words; leaving the* Greeks *to ſtand apart by themſelves from* Proteſtants *as well as other* Catholicks, n. 20.

The Greeks *confeſſed by him not to have oppoſed the* Latins *for holding* Tranſubſtantiation; *the* Latins *never to have accuſed the* Greeks *as not holding it*, n. 21.

2. *Concerning* Adoration *of the Euchariſt.* 1. *As to their Doctrine.*

Granted, 1. *That the* Greeks *allow and pay to the Myſteries in the Euchariſt an inferior relative Adoration.* 2. *A Supreme Adoration lawful and due to our Lords Humanity, where-ever preſent; and given by* Proteſtants *in their Communion.* 3. *No ſoveraign Adoration pretended by* Greeks *or* Latins *to be given to the Symbols (venerable only with an inferior cult) but to the Body and Blood of our Lord.* 4. Real Preſence *not being conteſted, but only* Tranſubſtantiation; *From ſuch Preſence (granting its true conſequences) follows a lawfulneſs of Adoration*, n. 22.

2. *As to their Practice.* 5. *The* Greeks *adore after their mode, by inclining the head and body. Whether this be only* relative *or* ſoveraign *Adoration, is underſtood from their Doctrine and Belief. For, not to allow the extent of their* Adoration, *as far as their belief of the* Preſence *of the Perſon adored; and their* Worſhip *the ſame latitude with their* Faith *ſeems unjuſt and groundleſs: as alſo to pretend only an* inferior *adoration given, where the ſame Communicants hold a* ſupreme *due to the Perſon* there *preſent*, n. 22.

More Devotions performed in the Weſtern *Churches than in the* Eaſt, *from the* Berengarian *Errors here*, n. 23.

M. Claude's *Conceſſions and their Conſequences ſufficient.* §. 1. *To diſwade from a Communion oppoſed both by* Greeks *and* Latins *concerning the Euchariſt.* 2. *To perſwade rather to the* Roman *Communion*, n. 24.

For trying our Obedience, God permits Evil with many Allurements; Error with many Veriſimilities; yet hath always left evidence enough to clear all neceſſary Truth to the humble and obedient, not to force the ſelf-confident and intereſſed, n. 25.

In

In a Search, by comparing Scriptures and Councils, what endleſs labour and diſtraction; in Obedience to Councils, what peace and vacancy for better employments! Beſides, that the rude and illiterate (the moſt of men) cannot ſearch. Muſt theſe believe a former Church now? or ſubmit to an inferior Church-Authority againſt a Supirior? But this is Schiſm in them both: and he juſtly ruined by believing an Authority uſurped, that denies to believe one whereto he is bound, n. 25.

The Iſſue of Scripture-Trial (long ſince) was a double ſenſe of Scripture: that Senſe was declared by one, nay ſeveral, Councils. The Party condemned appealed to Fathers *and* Primitive Church, *whoſe ſenſe (as formerly that of* Scripture*) being double, was decided again by Councils; but their Authority rejected. And now it is deſired that the Controverſie begin anew, and return to the Scriptures; or that the Queſtion determine the Controverſie; and, whilſt* Proteſtants *are the weaker party, that all have liberty; for, when the ſtronger, they too well diſcern the neceſſity of Synods for ending differences among themſelves, which (tho not held infallible, yet) upon the Evangelical Promiſes of our Lord's aſſiſtance, require on pain of* Suſpenſion, *ſubſcription to their Decrees, and* excommunicate *perſons teaching the contrary. Witneſs the* Dort *Synod,* n. 26.

M. Claude's *ſtrange Method for exempting from Obedience to the Church, thoſe that pretend not to a Certainty of their new Opinions, conſidered.*

That, if it prove valid, it ſerves as well Catholicks *againſt* Proteſtants *upon the ſame pretenſions; and affords both ſides the ſame plea one againſt the other, in any controverſie ariſing amongſt* Proteſtants, *Ibid.*

If ſeaching the Scripture be ſo neceſſary, ſearch there firſt this main point, that decides all others, and ſaves endleſs ſearches, viz. *our Lord's eſtabliſhing a juſt* Church-Authority *for ending Controverſies,* Ibid.

2. Invocation *of* Saints, §. 322.
3. Veneration *of* Images, §. 323.
4. Communion *in* one kind, §. 324.

2. *That ſuch Certainty, if in a Truth of ſmall importance, though it cannot yield an obedience of* Aſſent *to Church-Authority, yet ſtands obliged ſtill to an obedience of* ſilence, §. 330.
Conceded by Proteſtants, §. 331.

3. *That ſuch Certainty of a Truth, never ſo important, and neceſſary, (where one alſo is to be certain, that it is ſo,) though it be ſuppoſed free from the obedience of Aſſent; and of ſilence; yet ſtands obliged to a third, a* paſſive *obedience, to* Church-Authority, *a peaceable undergoing the* Church's *Cenſures (though this be the heavieſt,* Excommunication; *and that unjuſt;) without erecting, or joining to, any other external Communion, divided from it. Which third obedience only yielded, preſerves the Church from Schiſm,* §. 332, 333.

CON-

CONSIDERATIONS ON THE COUNCIL of TRENT.

CHAP. I.

Proteſtant-Objections againſt this Council.

Objected *by Proteſtants,*

1. *That the Council of* Trent *was not a* General Council. §. 3.
2. *That, not* Patriarchal. §. 4.
3. *That, not Free and Legal, in its Proceedings.* §. 5.
4. *That, ſeveral of its Deciſions are without, or contrary to,* Scripture, *to Primitive Tradition; and tyrannically Impoſed.* §. 6.
5. *That the Decrees of the Council touching* Reformation *were meerly Deluſory.* §. 6. *n.* 2.

THE moſt *General Councils* that can be procured joined alſo with S. *Peter's* Chair, being aſſerted in the former *Diſcourſes* † as the Supreme, and Final, Judge, and Decider, of Eccleſiaſtical Controverſies; And (of theſe Councils) that of *Trent* being, as the laſt, ſo, particularly applied to the Examining and Determination of all thoſe Points of Difference, which have lateſt afflicted theſe Weſtern Churches; ſo that, if the *Proteſtant* Party could be induced to accept, and acquieſce in, its Judgment, all moderne Controverſies of moment were ended; it ſeems neceſſary, for perfecting the Deſign of the former *Diſcourſes*, in the laſt place ſo far to vindicate the Supream, Legal, and Obliging Authority of this Council, from the many Objections, which *Proteſtants* bring againſt it; as that the more moderate among them may clearly ſee, that, if they are willing to ſubmit either their Judgment, or their Silence, to any ſuch Council, as the preſent times of the Church can afford, they have no juſt reaſon to deny it to this of *Trent.* §. 1.

† *Of the Guide in Controverſies.*

To manifeſt which, I will firſt ſet you down the chief Particulars, that are ordinarily urged by the later *Reformed* Writers againſt It: And then, ſhew you, what, in the ſame Particulars, may be ſaid for it: leaving both to your ſober Arbitrement; as in a matter which is of no leſs concernment to you, than the ſetling of your Faith in ſo many weighty Points of Religion, as this Learned and Wiſe Aſſembly hath determined: About which Points others ſtill remain queſtioning, and diſputing; Divided, as from the Church, ſo among themſelves; and uncapable of a Remedy.

I wish you, in the Reading of this, accompanied with *Soave's* History, on the one hand, and that of *Pallavicino*, on the other; to whom, for avoiding tediousness, I shall often referr you. To the first, as an Author of much Reputation with *Protestants*; and one, who, it seems, would let no Falsity pass, prejudicial to their Interest. To the second, as One, who, though of an opposite side, yet, contrary to *Soave's* practice, is careful, in matters of Weight, to signifie the Writings, from which he extracts his Intelligence; Nor do I, herein, exact from a *Protestant* Reader more credit to him, than his Margin, or other known History secures. Yet, if that be true, that *Cæsar Aquilino*, a *Roman-Catholick*, and quoted for this by a late *Protestant* Writer ‖, saith of him: — *That he hath done more disservice to the Church of* Rome *by his Answer, than ever Father* Paul [the unmasked *Pietro Soave*] *did with his History*, I have reason from this also to hope, that what I shall have occasion to cite out of him, will pass with the more credit, and better acceptation to a *Protestant* Reader; since both the first, and second, of these Histories are still pretended to advance their Cause. And, yet further, since the things, wherein *Aquilino* saith ‖ this disservice consists, are these,— *'Quod in illâ Histo-'riâ offendatur Romanorum Pontificum fama: — Hæreticorum dicta enumerantur, '& amplificantur: — Rixæ, Contentiones & Scandala inter Catholicos, quæ in Concilio acciderunt, sigillatim referuntur* [out of the *Vatican Archives* he perused] — *Quæ bona & recta* [he means, advantageous to the *Catholick* Cause] *â* Petro Soave *enarrata, vel minuuntur, vel prætermittuntur, vel in contradictionem vocantur*; in all which *Pallavicino* seems only censured, for not writing more cautiously, and partially, on the *Roman* side; and for not drawing the Council, and the Actions of it much fairer, and smoother, than the Truth, in those secret Papers, and Records he consulted, did discover them; lastly, for imprudently publishing, what the greatest Patrons of this Council are said † to have hitherto, with the greatest Art, concealed; I shall, I say, the more confidently for this make use of his Testimony, without any further Vindication of his Veracity; desiring *Protestants* to make their advantages of an Author reported so much assisting their Pretensions; and partaking so little of the Arts of a *Politician*; and, that valued more the fidelity of an Historian, than the promoting of the *Roman*, or *his own*, Interest; which Himself also sometimes as *freely* professeth, as they say, *truly*; observing—— *That History is like a Picture, then better, and more commendable, when it represents, not what is fairest; but, what likest to the Original.*

‖ *Stillingfl. Rat. Account* P. 481.

‖ *Aquilino.* p. 95.

† *Soave.* 7. *l.* Init.

§. 2.

This Council, then, being assembled since *Luther's* Reformation, and purposely disallowing, and condemning it, very sollicitous, and diligent have the *Reformed* likewise been in multiplying Arguments against it. Especially, they being assisted with the *History* thereof delivered by *Petro Soave Polano, i. e.* as is supposed by *Protestants*, *Father Paul*, a *Venetian Fryer*. Yet, indeed, against whose sincerity in composing this work, there seem not wanting many real *Exceptions*; if you please to consider with me.

1 First, that he lived in the time of the great dissension between the State of

of *Venice*, and the *Pope*; and then also, was engaged in Writings against the *Pope's* Proceedings; whence he may be suspected, in this work also, to have been too much biassed by a contrary Interest.

[2] Again, That, whenas he was but eleven years old at the concluding of this *Council*, and so could write nothing out of his own knowledge, but out of the Relations, and Notes of others, Printed, or Manuscript; yet very seldome, in things of so great moment, doth he inform the Reader, whence he extracts his matter; and is contradicted, in many of his Relations, by *Pallavicino*, referring, herein, to the Records of this Council, extant in several places, and to many other Writings sufficiently common, of such Persons, as were *Members* of the *Council*, or publickly employed in its Affairs, (the Names of which he sets down in his *l.* 18. *c.* 10. *n.* 14. and out of which, he saith, he compiled a good part of his own work): yet, none of which Writings, (as he collects from several passages of his History) had come to *Soave's* view.

[3] Next, That, for those things, wherein this *Author* lies under no suspicion of *Error*, as to the matter related; yet seems he frequently very culpable as to the *Colors*, he lays upon it. For, whereas no action can be for its substance so good, but that it may be vitiated, and change its nature from several Circumstances, so often as it is done out of an ill intention, or for some impious end, of Policy, Ambition, Covetousness, or the like; Nor, again, scarce any Truth can be, in its own light, so clear, and evident, but that some Verisimilities may be ranged on the other side, to obscure, and cloud it, this Author, for the *first* of these, through the course of his History, may be observ'd (contrary to the Modesty which is particularly proper to *Historians*) to asperse, and blemish the most specious, and candid actions of those (though the most sacred Persons) whose Interest he disfavors, with some or other uncharitable Gloss upon them; and to represent the faireſt fruit they bear, still worm-eaten with some corrupt Design, or malignant Intention, for which a bare possibility thereof seems his sufficient warrant to affirm it. And, again, for the *second*; constantly after each *Session* of this *Council*, He, under the Mask of the vulgar talk, and common Fame, takes liberty to sum together all that, which he apprehends may any way disparage the precedent *Decrees*; and that which perhaps never entred into any one's, save his own, fancy.

[4] Lastly, That he was a Person, with whom the Arch-Bishop of *Spalato* had an intimate Acquaintance; and of whom also he gives this Character (in the Preface to the first Edition of this History, *London*, 1619. which Preface is omitted in the latter, as some think, because it too manifestly discovers the Historian's Dis-affection to those, whose actions he relates): 'That he lived 'so in the *Roman* Captivity, as to guide himself by a right Conscience rather, 'than the common Customs: That he had a great Zeal to the purity of Re-'ligion, against such unexcusable [*i. e. Roman*] depravations thereof; That 'he abhorred those, who defended the Church of *Rome's* abuses, as holy In-'stitutions; and professed, Truth, wherever found, was to be embraced; 'That this his work was only known to him, and some others, his great Con-

sidents. From which, as also from some Extracts out of his Letters holding correspondence with some *French Hugonots* (mentioned in *Casoni's* Preface to the Second Volume of *Pallavicino*) may easily be gathered, that his Religion was much-what of the same temper and complexion, with that of *Spalatensis*: Unless perhaps we may think, that, after his writing this Book, he return'd to a better mind; and that, from this change, came that reluctance of his, *Spalatensis* mentions ‖, for communicating this work; Nay, (as the same *Bishop* relates it ‖) a Purpose, to have quite suppressed, and made it away; '*Destinato ad essere Sommerso dal suo Genitore.* Which thing as he imputes to his fear of some danger from it; so Charity will rather judge, that it proceeded from remorse of Conscience; when, in a pious reflection upon his former Conceptions, he discern'd, that, in stead of an *History*, he had brought forth a *Satyre*, against *God's* Truth, and his *Church*, and the most *Supreme*, and *Sacred* of those *Governors*, whom our *Lord* himself had appointed over It, and Him. However, this his *History* hath not so far corrupted the truth of Affairs, as not to contain in it many Evidences, very advantageous to the *Catholick Cause*; and so much remains sound in it, as may serve very well to confute that which is vitiated, and in the main things, that are charged against the *Pope*, and *Council*, (especially concerning the *Council's* Liberty), this *History* is found as it were, to destroy it self, by its own Contradictions. A thing, which, observed by *Phil. Quorlius* an *Italian* Doctor, produced his Book entituled; *Historia* Petri Soavis *ex Authorismet assertionibus confutata.* This account, in my entrance, I thought fit to give you of this Author, that you may see what just credit, on such a Subject, he deserves, out of whose Quiver the *Reformed* have taken most of those arrows, with which they seek to wound this *Council*. The Chief of which I shall first summarily relate to you, and so proceed to its intended Defence.

‖ Prefat. to *Soave's* History.

§. 3. First then, it is Objected by the *Protestant* Divines, That this of *Trent* can no way truly be called a *General Council*, as it is stiled by the *Romanists*.

1. α. 'Because it is necessary to the Generalness of a *Council*, that 'some be there, and those Authorized, from all particular Churches. [See 'Archbishop *Lawd*, §. 27. n. 3. where he quotes *Bellarmin* ‖ for it,] But none 'from the *Eastern* Churches were present in this of *Trent*, or so much as summoned; or, afterwards, approved, or consented unto, its Acts: And β. 'the number of the *Bishops*, who were present from other Churches, was frequently so small, that in many *Sessions* it had scarce ten Arch-Bishops, or forty, or fifty *Bishops*, present [Bishop *Lawd*, §. 27. n. 2.] And, That it 'had not so many *Bishops* present at the Determination of the weightiest Controversies concerning the *Rule* of *Faith*, as the *King* of *England* could have 'called together in his own Dominions at any one time upon a Month's warning (B. *Bramhal*, Vindic, c. 9. p. 247. And see what *Soave* saith to the same purpose, *l.* 2. *p.* 163.) Add to this, γ. 'That it was not lawfully called, so as *General Councils* ought, and used to be; namely, by the *Emperor*, 'and other Christian *Princes*; but only by the *Pope* [this was one of *Henry* the '8th's Pleas in his *Manifestos* against it]. Lastly, δ. 'That the *Popes* them-

‖ *De Council.* l. 1. c. 17. §. 4. *ut saltem.*

'themselves, as many as lived in the time thereof, would never consent, that 'this *Council* should be affirmed to represent the *Universal Church*; prudently foreseeing, that, if this were granted (as in the Council of *Constance* it 'was), the *Council*, as being the whole, would put off its subjection, and depend no longer on the *Pope*, that was but a part of it; nor would need his 'confirmation, to render it what it was before; *viz.* the *Representative* of the whole *Church* [thus Dr. *Hammond*. Her. 11. §. n. 8. 9.]. This against its being a *General Council*.

2. That neither was it a plenary *Patriarchal Council*, for the *West*. ε. Because from some Churches in the *West*, as from the *Britannick*, and some other *Reformed* Churches, there were no Bishops present there; who also had just cause for their not coming thither (B. *Lawd*, ib. n. 2.): neither can it justly be pleaded, that they were Heretical, or Schismatical Churches, being never condemned by any former Council (B, *Bramhal*, Answer to *Chalced*. p. 351.) ζ. And, of other *Western* Churches, (save only *Italy*) present very few; in all the *Sessions* under *Paul* the 3*d*. but two *French-men*; and sometimes, none; as, in the sixth *Session* under *Julius* the 3*d*. (B. *Lawd*. ib. n. 2.) §. 4. 2. ε. ζ.

And η. Twice so many Bishops out of *Italy* present, as there were out of 'all other Christian Nations put together, (B. *Bramh*. Vind. p. 247.) as appears at the end of the *Council*; where the *Italians* are set down 187. and 'all the rest make but 83. (B. *Lawd*, §. 29. n. 2.) ϑ. Neither was this *Council*, 'after its rising, fully aknowledged, or received, by the *Western* Churches; 'not, by the *Britannick*, and other *Reformed* Churches; κ, Nor, by the *Gallican* Church of the *Roman* Communion: And, Let no man say (saith B. *Bramh*. 'Vind. p. 248.) that they rejected the Determinations thereof only in point of '*Discipline*, not of *Doctrine*; for, the same Canonical Obedience is equally 'due to an acknowledged *General*, [I add, or other Superior] *Council* in point 'of Discipline, as in point of Doctrine. η. ϑ. κ.

3. 'That it was not a *Free*, and *Lawful Council*. 1. λ. 'Where the accusers, or the accused (take, whether you please) namely, the '*Pope*, and the *Bishops*, persons of the same perswasion, and communion with 'him, sate as Judges in their own cause; namely, in a Question, of the '*Pope's Supremacy*, and of the corruptions of that Church (see B. *L*. '§. 27. n. 1. and *Henry* 8. *Manifestos*). μ. Especially *Pope Leo* in his Bull having declared and pronounced the Appellants Hereticks, before they were 'condemned by the Council. 2. ν. 'Where 'was no security in the place of Meeting, for the *Reformed* party to come 'thither; nor where no form of Safe-conduct could be trusted, since the 'cruel Decrees, and behaviour of the Council of *Constance* towards *John* '*Huß*, though armed with a safe Conduct. ξ. Whither also, notwithstanding this, some of the *Protestant* party being come, yet they were not 'suffered to propose, and dispute their cause: And again, π. Where, after 'dispute, (had it been granted them) yet they, if no *Bishops*, could not have 'been permitted to have had any decisive vote with the rest; but must, after the §. 5. 3. λ. 1. μ. ν. 2. ξ. π.

'the Disputation, have been judged, and censured by their Adversaries.

§. 2. 3. §. 'Where, all the Members of the Council, that had a vote, had taken 'an *Oath of Fidelity* to the *Papacy*; and none had suffrage, but such as were 'sworn to the Church of *Rome*, and were professed enemies to all that called

σ 1 4. 'for Reformation, or a free Council; (*B. Laud*, §. 27. n. 1. 4. σ.) * Where 'nothing might be voted or debated in Council, but only what the *Pope's* Le-

σ 2 'gates propos'd; the *Pope's* Commission running, *Proponentibus Legatis*, &c.** 'where nothing was determined, till the *Pope's* judgment thereof was brought 'from *Rome*, (himself not vouchsafing to be present therein); and therefore, it 'was commonly said, that this Council was guided by the Holy Ghost sent

τ. 5. 'from *Rome* in a Male. 5. τ. Where many *Bishops* had Pensions from 'the *Pope*; and many *Bishops* were introduced, who were only titular; and

‖ B. *Bramh.* Vindic. of Ch. of *Engl* p. 248. '‖ divers new Bishopricks also erected by the *Pope*, during the *Council*; all this 'to enable therein the *Papalines* to over-vote the *Tramontanes*: and hence, 'such an unproportionable number, there, of *Italian* Bishops,

§. 6.

4. υ. Suppose the *Council*, in all these Objections, cleared; suppose it never so *Oecumenical*, and Legal; yet have the *Reformed* this Reserve, after all, wherefore they cannot justly entertain it; * 'Because some of the *Decrees*,

υ. 'and Definitions, are repugnant to the *Holy Scriptures*; or, at least, not war-

φ. 'ranted by them, φ. This Council not regulating its proceedings wholly by 'the *Scriptures*, as the *Nicene*, and other primitive *Councils* did; but holding '*Tradition extra Scripturam* a sufficient Ground of making Definitions in mat-'ter of Faith. [Concerning which, thus Arch-Bishop *Laud*, §. 28. — *The* Scripture *must not be departed from in Letter, or in necessary sense, or the* Council *is not Lawful. For the consent and confirmation of* Scripture *is of far greater authority, to make the* Council *Authentical, and the Decisions of it*, de fide, *than any confirmation of the* Pope *can be.* — *Now the Council of* Trent, *we are able to prove, had not the first*, [but have departed from the Letter, and sense of Scripture] *and so we have no reason to respect the second.* See likewise, §. 27. n. 1. Where he asks — *How that Council is Legal, which maintains it lawful to conclude a Controversie, and make it to be* de fide, *though it hath not the written word of God for warrant, either in expres Letter, or necessary sense, and deduction; but is quite* extra, *without, the Scripture?* — See also Mr *Stillingfl.* p. 477, &, 478] χ. 'Or * Because some of its *Decrees* are repugnant to, or at least not 'warranted by, *Primitive* and *Apostolical Tradition* ‖. ψ. And, in the

χ. ψ. ‖ Dr. *Hammond of Her.* §. 11. n. 3, 7. last place, 'Because this *Council* hath imposed *Anathemas*, in these, and in 'many other slight matters (if truths,) upon all those, who shall dissent from, 'or at least, who shall contradict, their Judgment in them; (this one *Council*

‖ *Soave*, p. 228. 'having made near hand as many *Canons*, as all the preceding Councils of 'the Church put together:) ‖ and among these hath added twelve new Arti-'cles to the former *Creeds*; * drawn up by *Pius* the 4th. according to the

‖ *Sess* 24. c. 12. *de Refor.* 'order of the *Council* †: and * imposed to be believed by all, who would enter 'into the communion of the Church; contrary to the 7th. *Can.* of the Third '*General Council* at *Ephesus*. All these Articles Imposed too, as Fundamen-'tal; and to be assented to, as absolutely, and explicitly, for attaining salva-

tion

tion, as the Articles of the *Creed*; and ſo, that, in disbelieving any of them, 'it profits nothing to have held all the reſt of the Catholick Faith entire; 'which Articles are concluded, there, as the *Athanaſian* Creed, with an '——*Hæc vera Catholica Fides, extra quam nemo Salvus* ||. So that (ſaith Mr. *Thorndike*†) *it was the Acts of this Council, that formed the Schiſme; becauſe whereas the Reformation might have been proviſional, till a better underſtanding between the Parties might have produced a tolerable agreement, this proceeding of* Trent *cut off all hopes of Peace, but by yielding to all their Decrees.*

|| See Archbiſhop *Lawd*, p. 51. ——Biſhop *Bramh.* Vindic. of Church of *England*, p. 230 231. —Reply to *Chalced.* p. 322. ——Dr. *Hammond*, Anſ. to Cath. Gent. p. 138. ——and to Schiſm Diſarm'd, p. 241. ——Dr. *Fern.* Conſiderations touching Reformation, p. 45. ——*Stillingfl.* Rat. Account, p. 48, &c. † *Epilog. Concluſion*, p. 413.

5. This for the Articles touching *Doctrine*. And next, For thoſe of *Reformation*, which alſo are very numerous; and, one would think, the more, the better: yet, theſe alſo are not free from their complaints. §. 6. n. 2. 5. ω.

ω. 'That theſe *Decrees* are meer Illuſions; many of them of ſmall weight; taking Motes out of the eye, and leaving Beams. That the *Council*, in framing them, imitated the Phyſician, who, in an Hectical Body, laboured to kill the Itch? That the Diſeaſes in the Church are ſtill preſerved, and ſome Symptoms only, cured. That, in ſome of more conſequence, the Exceptions are larger, than the Rule: And αα. That the *Pope*'s Diſpenſative 'power may null and qualifie them, as he pleaſeth. (Thus *Soave* frequently). 'That nothing of Reformation followed upon them, and the 'moſt important things to that end could never paſs the *Council*; and, it 'ended, ββ. great rejoicing in *Rome*, that they had cheated the World ſo, 'that that, which was intended to clip the Wings of the Court of *Rome*, 'had confirmed and advanced the Intereſt of it ||. αα. ββ.

|| *Stillingfl.* Rat. Acc. p. 480, 482.

Moſt of theſe Objections you may find, after *Soave*, urged; by Arch-biſhop *Lawd*, §. 27. &c. and reinforced, in his Defence, by Mr. *Stillingfl.* p. 2. c. 8. ——By B. *Bramh.* Vind. c. 9. ——By Dr. *Hammond*, of Her. §. 11. and many others; whether with more force, and advantage, than is here ſet down, I muſt deſire you to conſult the Authors.

Theſe are the principal *Exceptions*, occurring in later *Proteſtant-Writers* againſt the *Council* of *Trent*. Now, I deſire your patience to hear on the other ſide, what may be ſaid for it. Which *Council*, being, by reaſon of the ſubjection of the *Clergy* to ſo many ſupreme and independent *Princes*, with ſo much difficulty conven'd; not finally concluded till Eighteen years after its firſt ſitting; interrupted by ſickneſs; interrupted by Wars; managed under ſeveral *Popes* of ſeveral inclinations; and under often-changed intereſts of moſt warlike, and rival *Princes*, according to their ſeveral advantages or diſguſts, who now ſent, now withdrew, their *Biſhops*, and deſired to model its Decrees to the content of their Subjects, and ſecular Peace in their Dominions; It muſt needs encounter great diverſity of Accidents, and not always retain the ſame face, ſecurity, frequency, ſplendor, and §. 7.

and reputation, nor the same purity, and dis-engagement from secular affairs, and national obligations.

Again, *Sitting in the time, and for the composing, of the greatest, and the most powerful (considering the engagement of the common people, as well as of Princes) separation and division, that ever was in the Christian Church, which departed also, from the former unity, in so many points of Doctrine and Discipline, as never did any before; and * driving two main designs at once, the reformation of manners in the *Church*, and its *Governors*; and the confutation of errors in the *Sectaries*, It must needs be liable to many *Intestine*, as well as *External*, affronts and hinderances from all sides; and, in so many decisions, seem to some, to commit not a few oversights. But yet, notwithstanding all these Intrigues, and all, that is produced against it, I see not, but that both its *Authority*, and *Integrity* may be rationally and justly vindicated.

§. 8. The *Considerations* upon it, for the more orderly proceeding in them, I
1. shall reduce to these Heads. 1. Concerning the *Generality*, *Liberty*,
2. and just *Authority*, of this Council, or of the persons constituting it, to oblige the Church's Subjects; or especially, those of the *West*. 2. Concerning the *Invalidity*, and also, probably, the *uneffectiveness* of such a *General Council*, as the *Protestants*, in stead thereof, demanded; and, as should be
3. limited with all the conditions they proposed. 3. Concerning the *Legal Proceedings* of this Council of *Trent*, especially as to those matters,
4. which respect the *Protestants*. 4. The many *Definitions* and *Anathe-*
5. *mas* of this *Council*, and its pretended-new Articles of Faith. 5. Concerning the many *Constitutions*, and *Acts* of great consequence, passed in this *Council*, and confirmed by the *Pope*, for the *Reformation* of several corrupt practices, and disorders, observed in the Church's *Government*, or *Discipline*.

CHAP. II.

Of Councils inferior to General.

The due Subordinations, and other Regulations, of them. §. 9.

1. *The several Councils, at least so high as the Patriarchal, to be called, and moderated, by their respective Ecclesiastical Superiors, or Presidents; and nothing to be passed by them, without his; or by Him without their, consent.* §. 10.
2. *No Introduction, or Ordination, of Inferior Clergy to be made without Approbation, or Confirmation of the Superior.* §. 11.
3. *Differences between Inferiors, upon Appeal, to be decided by Superiors; and those of higher persons, and in greater Causes, by the* Bishop *of the* first See §. 12. *(Where, concerning his contest, about this, with the* Africans. §. 13. n. 2.)

Yet; that no Persons, or Synods, co-ordinate might usurp authority one over another:

ther: Nor, all Causes ascend to the Highest Courts; and, many, without troubling the Synod, in its Interval to be decided by its President. §. 14.

4. *Obedience, in any dissent happening amongst Superiors, to be yielded to the Superior of them.*

The Concessions of Learned Protestants, *touching the Precedents.* §. 16.

5. *No Addresses, or Appeals, permitted, from the Superior Ecclesiastical, to any Secular, Judge, or Court.* §. 20.

Where, That the Church, *from the beginning, was constituted a distinct Body from the* Civil State. §. 21.

And, what seem to be Her Rights and Priviledges, (as so distinct.) §. 22.

§. 9. CONcerning the first Head; to discern, more clearly, the true State of this *Council*, assembled at *Trent*, It seems necessary, that I, first, give you a brief account of some things more generally appertaining to these *Ecclesiastical Courts.*

Of *Councils* then assembled, as need required, for deciding Controversies, enacting Laws, and preserving the Peace of the Church Catholick, (which is but *one*, throughout the world); there have been always used in the Church these several Kinds, or Compositions, subordinate in Dignity, and Authority, one to another, 1 *Episcopal*, or *Diocesan*; 2 *Provincial*, 3 *National*, 4 *Patriarchal*, and 5 *Oecumenical*, or *General.* Of which *Councils* the first Pattern, under the Gospel, was that held at *Jerusalem*, Act. 15. *A. D.* 51.

Amongst these, the lowest Synod, or Ecclesiastical *Council*, for governing the Church, was *Episcopal*, or *Diocesan* (taking the word in its modern sense): consisting of the *Bishop* of any particular *Dioceſs*, and his *Presbyters*; the *Bishop* calling them together, and moderating the Assembly, the Actions, and Decrees, of which Synod were appealable from, and liable to the Judgment, and Censure, of an higher Council.

The next Council was *Provincial*; consisting of all the Bishops of a *Province* (in which were many Dioceſses): called, and moderated, and its Decrees executed, by the *Metropolitan.*

The next Synod (to whom also the Actions, and Decrees, of this *Provincial* were subject) was *National*; consisting of the *Metropolitans* of several *Provinces* with their *Bishops*; called, and moderated, by the chief *Primate* in such a Nation; such were several of the *African* Councils, and particularly, that held under St. *Cyprian, de Baptizandis Hæreticis*; there being of these Provinces or greater Circuits, six in *Affrick*; and so many *Primates*, or *primæ Sedis Episcopi*, of whom the Chief was the Bishop of *Carthage.*

The next, a Council *Patriarchal*; consisting of the *Metropolitans*, &c of divers Kingdoms, and Countries, which were contained under the same *Patriarchy*; this called, and moderated by the *Patriarch.*

The last, and supremest, is a Council *Oecumenical*, or *General*; to which I should proceed next; to shew you, of what Persons it is to consist: who is to call, who is to preside in, to regulate, and ratifie it, *&c.* But this I shall defer till §. 34. And, because the *Regulation*, and *Government* that is,

for the neceſſary preſerving of the Church's firmer Peace and Unity, eſtabliſhed, and obſerved in theſe lower Councils, is, by their being more frequently held, much better known, and alſo freely acknowledged by Learned *Proteſtants*, I will firſt give you ſome further Account of this; that, ſo, you may make a better Judgment of the Nature, and Condition of *General Councils*, and of that, which is requiſite in them, (at laſt to be applied to that of *Trent*): which *General Councils*, by reaſon of the Difficulty, Charge, and many other Inconveniences, of ſo univerſal an Aſſembly, have been much more rarely convened in the Church.

I. §. 10.

In theſe aſſemblies then fore-named; for the unity and peace of the Church,

1ſt. It was ordered; That the Inferiors, (though joined in a Council) could eſtabliſh nothing (in things that were of moment, and concern'd the whole Body; as in matters of Faith, and Manners, Ordination of Clergy, *&c*) without the Superior's, or Preſident's, conſent; nor He, without their's, *i. e.* of the major part of them: For example; The *Presbyters* nothing, without their *Biſhop*; nor the *Biſhops*, without their *Metropolitan*; nor *Metropolitans*, without the *Primate*, or *Patriarch*; *& è contra*. Of which thus the 35. *Can. Apoſtol.* ---'*Epiſcopos Gentium ſingularum ſcire convenit; quis inter* '*eos primus* [this aſcends ſo high as Primats] *habeatur; quem, velut Caput ex-* '*iſtiment; & nihil amplius, præter ejus conſcientiam, gerant, quàm illa ſola ſin-* '*guli, quæ paraciæ propriæ & villis, quæ ſub eâ ſunt, competunt. Sed nec Ille, præ-* '*ter omnium conſcientiam, faciat aliquid in eorum paraciis. Sic enim* Unanimi-'tas *erit, & glorificabitur Deus, per Chriſtum, in Spiritu Sancto.*

And ſee the ſame repeated in *Conc. Antioch. Can.* 9. And, this Apoſtol. Can. there referred to; In which by ἄνευ τῆς τοῦτου γνώμης, *præter ſententiam illius qui primus eſt*, muſt be underſtood, not the *Council's* doing nothing without this Primate, firſt *conſulted*; and, then, if He, and they, or a major part of them, do differ in opinion, He obliged to follow this major part, as ſome † *Proteſtants* would have it † quoting *Conc. Antiochen.* c. 19. as favouring ſuch a ſenſe: but the *Council's* doing nothing without this *Primate's conſent*; the *Council*, or major part of it, and he the *Preſident*, having both of them, a negative voice in reſpect of one another; and, ſo, ſuch matters, as both do not concur in, being to remain undecided, till their agreement; or, till ſuch Cauſe is by ſome party devolved to a Superior Court, (if ſuch difference doth not happen in the Supreme). Otherwiſe, if, by [γνώμης] be meant, only *Knowledge*, or *Advice*, the one partie's conſulting, or acquainting the other with ſuch a matter; then, ſince that Canon runs alſo, that the *Primate* ſhall do nothing *præter Epiſcoporum* [γνώμην] *ſententiam*, yet this will not hinder, but that he, alone, may make ſuch Decrees alſo, without the conſent of the *Council*, or of the major part of them; and on neither ſide muſt the word ſignifie any more, than their *Counſel*, and *Advice*.

† *See* Dr. Fie'd, *of the Church*, p. 511.

As for that paſſage of the 19*th*. *Antiochian* Canon urged——'*Obtineat Sententia plurimorum* (the like to which ſee *Conc. Nice*, Can. 6) it means only, That the unanimous ſuffrage of *all* the *Provincial Biſhops*, joined with the *Metropolitan*, will not be neceſſary, for the Ordination of a new *Biſhop*; whenas

whenas perhaps ſome, *propter ſuum contentionis ſtudium*, may contradict; and not, That ſuch major part may paſs ſuch Acts *without*, or *againſt*, the *Metropolitan*; The *conſent* of which *Metropolitan*, for the Ordination, or Confirmation of ſuch a *Biſhop*, is expreſly required by the 4th. and 6th. *Canon* of the firſt *General* Council of *Nice*.

II. §. 11.

2ly. For preſerving the ſame Peace, and Unity, it was ſo ordered; That no *Biſhop*, in any Dioceſs, could be Ordained, or exerciſe any Juriſdiction belonging to ſuch place, without the conſent, or confirmation of the *Metropolitan*; nor *Metropolitan*, in any Province, without the Confirmation of the *Patriarch*. See *Can. Apoſt.* 35.--*Conc. Nic.* Can 4, 6.---*Conc. Antioch. c.* 9. 19.--*Conc. Laodic. c.* 12.--2. *Conc. Carthag. c.* 12.--*Conc. Conſtantinop. c.* 2. --*Conc. Epheſ. c.* 8, [Where note; That, not the *Confirmation* of the *Cyprian Metropolitan*, but the *Election* and *Ordination* of him (of which the *Cyprian* Biſhops complained, that they were deprived), is denied in this Canon to the *Antiochian Patriarch*, as *Res nova*, and contrary to former Cuſtomes; this thing properly belonging to the *Provincial* Synod]- *Conc. Chalced.* 28. And here note, that theſe later Canons maintain the *Mos antiquus obtineat*, of the 6th. *Nicene* Canon, and ſo preſerve unviolated the ancient preeminencies of the Chief *Patriarchs*, as well as thoſe of inferior *Primates*, or *Metropolitans*. After all which, the 8th. General Council, *Can.* 17, reciting the foreſaid 6th. Canon of *Nice*, thus explains it——*Quâ pro causâ, & hac magna & ſancta Synodus, tam in ſeniori, & novâ Româ* [Conſtantinopoli] *quàm in Sede Antiochia, & Hieroſolymorum, priſcam conſuetudinem decernit in omnibus conſervari; ita, ut earum Præſules, univerſorum Metropolitanorum, qui ab ipſis promoventur, & ſive per manus impoſitionem, ſive per Pallii dationem, Epiſcopalis dignitatis firmitatem accipiunt, habeant poteſtatem*; viz. *ad convocandum eos, urgente neceſſitate, ad Synodalem Conventum; vel etiam ad coercendum illos, & corrigendum, cùm fama eos ſuper quibuſdam delictis forſitan accuſaverit.* Of which Canon, thus Dr. *Field*, p 518. -- *Patriarchs were, by the Order of the 8th. General Council* † *to confirm the Metropolitans ſubject unto them, either by Impoſition of Hands, or giving the Pall.*—And *l.* 5. *c.* 37. *p.* 551.—*Without the Patriarch's conſent, none of the Metropolitans, ſubject unto them, might be Ordained.*—And—*What they bring* (ſaith he) *proves nothing that we ever doubted of; For we know. the Biſhop of* Rome *had the Right of confirming the Metropolitans within the Precincts of his own Patriarchſhip, as likewiſe every other Patriarch had.* And thus B. *Bramhal*, (Vindic. *c.* 9. *p.* 259. &c.)—*What power the Metropolitan had over the Biſhops of his own Province; the ſame had a Patriarch over the Metropolitans, and Biſhops of ſundry Provinces, within his own Patriarchate.* And afterward—*Wherein, then, conſiſted Patriarchal Authority? In Ordaining their Metropolitans, or Confirming them*, &c.

† Can. 17.

III. §. 12.

3ly. Again ſo ordered: That, any difference ariſing between any inferior, perſons, or Councils, either of an equal degree; as between two *Presbyters*, or two *Biſhops*, or their *Synods*; or an unequal; as between a *Presbyter*, and his *Biſhop*; between a *Biſhop*, and his *Metropolitan*; or their *Synods*; a repair,

for the decision thereof, should be made to the next Person, or Council, Superior to both. Nor might obedience, by an Inferior, be denied to, or a discession made from, any Superior, upon something thought criminous in him, before such judgment of an higher Court were first passed, discharging such Inferiors of their duty. See *Conc. Nic.* Can. 4, 5, 6.---*Conc. Sard.* Can. 7. --- *Conc. Chalced.* Can. 9. --- 8. *General* Council, *c.* 10. & 26. compared with the 17. expounding the 6th. Can. of the *Nicene* Council.

Thus, then, all inferior Conciliar differences of much consequence were terminated, if not sooner, ultimately in a *General Council*, when it could be had; and personal appeals, in the Interval of Councils, (which, whether Episcopal, Provincial, or Patriarchal, cannot be, upon every cause, without great trouble, and charge, convened), were, as for *greater* causes, and persons, (as those of the other *Patriarchs*, or eminent Bishops) ended by the *Prime Patriarch*, the Bishop of *Rome*; who made use of such Bishops for his Assessors, and Council, as could with convenience, upon such appeals, be brought together. See the Council of *Sardica*, *can.* 4, 5. Concerning the just Authority of which Council, I refer the Protestant-Reader to Mr. *Thorndike's* Defence thereof, *Epil. l.* 3. *c.* 21. *p.* 181. and *Just weights*, p. 40.

§. 13. n. 1.

But see this practice of Appeals to the *First See* much more ancient; not only, as to the *West*, in the Provinces subject to this *Patriarch*: where we meet with the appeal of *Basilides*, and *Martialis*, two *Spanish* Bishops, desiring by him to be restored to their Bishopricks, of which they pretended they were unjustly deprived ‖; (in which matter *S. Cyprian* † indeed blames the *Pope*, for receiving them rashly into his Communion, when he had not well examined their Cause, nor the justice of the former Sentence passed in *Spain* on them; but not at all, for his admitting, as *Patriarch*, their appeal): and find * the Request of the said *S. Cyprian* ‖, made to the *Pope* for his Letter, to the Bishops of *France*, to depose *Marcianus* a *French* Bishop, for siding with the *Novatians*; again,* the appeal of *Cecilianus*, *Primate* of *Carthage*, who was wronged by a Council held in *Affrick*, to the *Pope*, and his Council; related, and justified against the *Donatists*, by S. *Austin*, Ep. 162. But, as to the *East* also; where we find the appeal of *Athanasius*, Patriarch of *Alexandria*, and of *Paulus* Bishop of *Constantinople*, wronged by the *Arian*, *Eastern* Synods: And, long before these, the appeal of *Dionysius Alexandrinus*, accused to the *Pope* by some of *Pentapolis* †, and so making his Defence to Him, and cleared by him and his Council.

‖ *Cyprian*, Ep 38. † Ep. 68.

‖ Ep. 67.

† *Athanas de Sententia Dionys. Alexandrin.*

All these, before the Decree of *Sardica*; as for the times after it, I suppose it needless to mention the appeals of St. *Chrysostom* ‖, *Theodoret* †, *Flavianus*, and other *Eastern* Bishops.

‖ Ep. *ad Innocent.* † Ep. *ad Leonem.*

§. 13. n. 2.

As for the famous Contest, that was had about these Appeals, between *Sozimus*, and *Bonifacius*, *Popes*, and the *African* Bishops, after *A. D.* 400. and after so many eminent former allowed Examples of such Appeals,

1st. The Constitution of those *African* Prelates in a Council, held about

about the same time (whether it were the *Milevitan*, or rather another at *Carthage*, as some think, it much matters not), prohibits such appeals beyond Sea only to the inferior Clergy, in these words, || ---*Placuit, ut Presbyteri, Diaconi, vel cæteri inferiores Clerici, in causis, quas habuerint*, &c, *non provocent, nisi ad Africana Concilia, vel ad Primates Provinciarum suarum.* || Conc. *Milev.* vit. c. 22. But it enjoins nothing concerning Bishops. 2ly. In their dispute with *Boniface*, they handled the matter so gently, that, as *Baronius* observes †, † *A. D.* 418. they seem'd to debate rather *de modo*, than *de Re*; bespeaking him on this manner || ---*Impendio deprecamur, ut ad vestras aures hinc venientes non* faciliùs *admittatis.* --- [Upon which words *Spalatensis* comments thus † ---*Rogant ut* Episcopi *non tam* facilè *audiantur* [i. e, à Rom. Pontifice], *nisi* viz. *notoria, & manifesta adsit suspicio in propria Provincia Episcopis omnibus, aut maximâ eorum parte.* For he grants there ---*Ubi gravis & notoria est suspicio erga proprios & primarios Judices, Episcopos reos potuisse ad aliena,* [or extera], *judicia, præsertim verò ad sedes Apostolicas, recurrere*; and quotes, for it, St. *Austin*, Ep. 162. in *Cæcilian's* case.] And ---*Concilium Nicenum voluit observari, ne in suâ Provinciâ Communione suspensi, à suâ sanctitate, vel* festinatò, *vel* præproperè, *vel* indebitè *videantur communioni restitui.* For, the *common* practice of such Appeals in former times, by *Athanasius*, and others, shews; that the *Roman Bishop* was not prohibited by these Canons of *Nice* to admit into his Communion any such Bishop, as was excommunicated by his Province, if the *Roman* Bishop found him wrongfully suspended. And therefore 'tis true also, that the 6th. *Nicene* Canon --*Episcopos suis Metropolitanis apertissimè commisit* (which the *Africans* urged): but not this in every case unappealable to Superiors, as appears by their former Qualification, --- *Ne* festinato, *ne* præproperè, *&c.* And, particularly for this Province of *Affrick*, -- S. *Austin* undertakes, against the *Donatists*, a Justification of the Appeal made formerly to a Transmarine Judgment (the *Donatists*, much opposing it) by *Cæcilianus* Bishop of *Carthage*, when injur'd by an *African* Council of Seventy Bishops: The Father giving there his reason also for the Equity of such Appeal; because such *Ecclesia transmarina* was *à privatis inimicitiis, & ab utrâque parte dissensionis, aliena.* Where also he justifies *Melchiades* Bishop of *Rome* his admission of this Appeal ---*An fortè non debuit* (saith he) *Romanæ Ecclesiæ*, Melchiades, *Episcopus cum Collegis, transmarinis Episcopis, illud sibi usurpare judicium, quod ab Afris septuaginta, ubi Primas* [Numidiæ], *Tigisitanus præsedit, fuerat terminatum? Quid, quod nec usurpavit? Rogatus Imperator Judices misit Episcopos, qui cum eo sederent & de totâ illâ causâ, quid justum videretur, statuerent.* And, a little after the foresaid Contest, in the Appeal made to *Rome* by one *Antonius*, constituted formerly Bishop of *Fussala* by S. *Austin*, This Father, writing an Epistle to *Pope Celestine* about it, there no way declines his Sentence, but only supplicates his favour, in it—*Collabora nobiscum, obsecro & jube, tibi, quæ directa sunt, omnia recitari—Existat exemplo, ipsâ Apostolicâ sede judicante, vel aliorum judicia firmante, quosdam*, &c. And the same Father, relating to the forecited *African* Canon ‖, argues thus, against the *Donatists*, the lawfulness of *Cæcilian's* Transmarine Appeal †:--- *Neq; enim* (saith he) *de Presbyteris* ‖ Conc. *Milev.* vit. c. 22. † Ep. 162. *ant*

aut Diaconis, aut inferioris Ordinis clericis, sed de collegis [Episcopis] *agebatur; Qui possunt aliorum Collegarum, & præsertim Apostolicarum Ecclesiarum, judicio causam suam integram reservare.* Upon which passage, joined with some other Reasons, some † have contended, that the Acts, and Epistles of the 6th. Council of *Carthage* to the *Pope*, quarrelling about Appeals, are forged and counterfeit: These Acts arguing just contrary to S. *Austin*, thus; — *If an Appeal not permitted to inferior Clergy, much less to Bishops.* † — *Etsi* (say they) *de inferioribus Clericis, vel Laicis videtur ibi,* [in the *Nicene* Canon], *præcaveri, quanto magis de Episcopis voluit observari?* &c. And Dr. *Field*, touching this matter, hath these words ‖: — *The Africans, though within the Patriarchship of* Rome, *disliked the Appeal of their Bishops to* Rome, *because they might have right against their Metropolitans in a General Synod of* Africk, *wherein the Primate sate, as President. For, otherwise, Bishops wronged by their Metropolitans might, by the Canons, appeal to their own* Patriarch. Thus he. *For otherwise*, here meaneth he not; when such Councils do not sit? (For, surely, he would not have a *Provincial* Council purposely new-called upon every personal contention): But this overthrows the arguments of the *African* Bishops, who also are said to have denied such Appeals, not when *African* Councils sit only, but altogether. Again, S. *Austin* clearly justifies Appeals from *African* Councils also. This, of the *African* Controversie about Appeals, of as little advantage to non-Appealants, as it is of great noise, if the matter be, on both sides, equally weighed.

† See Ant. Cappellus *de Appellationibus. c. 4.*

† *Epist. Celest.*

‖ *Of the Church*, p. 563.

§. 13. n. 3.

Again, Touching another ancient Contest, that happened, (and is also urged by *Protestants*) between the *Cyprian* Bishops, and the Patriarch of *Antioch*, decided in the 3d. *General* Council. Can. 8. you may observe: That, whatever priviledge, or exemption, any Church, or Province may have had, from any Patriarch or his Council, as to *Elections*, or *Ordinations*; yet no Church, or Person, hath been freed from a submittance thereto, in point of *Appeals*; or of *Decision* of *Controversies* in matter of Faith. Neither here can the *Cyprian* Bishops by vertue of any such Canon of *Ephesus* plead their particular exemption from the 7th. Canon of *Sardica*, or 9th. of *Chalcedon*, (which Canon is also seconded by the Imperial Law, in *Cod. Tit. 4. c. 29*) or from the 17th, or 26th. Canon of the 8th. *General* Council; which Canons command such submittance, and allow such Appeals; in which Appeals also the Inferior Patriarchs were subject to the Superior (See before §. 12, 13, and below, the Concession of Dr. *Field*, §. 16. n, 5.); And of the Jurisdiction of the *Antiochian* Patriarch over *Cyprus*, as to these matters still remaining after the Canon of *Ephesus*, see S. *Jerom* ‖ in his controversie with *John*, Bishop of *Jerusalem*---*Ni fallor, hoc ibi* [i. e. in Concilio Niceno], *ut* Palestinæ *Metropolis* Cæsarea *sit*; *& totius Orientis*, Antiochia. *Aut igitur ad Cæsariensem Archiepiscopum referre debueras, cui, spretâ communione tuâ, communicare nos noveras; aut, si procul expetendum judicium erat*, Antiochiam *potius litera dirigenda.* [*Totius Orientis*; and so, *Cypri.*]

‖ *Epist. ad Pammachium.*

§. 14.

Mean while, in this necessary Subordination of the lower Clergy, or their Synods, to the higher,

1st.

1st. Care was taken; That *Co-ordinate* Churches, or Provinces, or their Synods, (*i. e.* such, whereof the one could claim no Jurisdiction over the other, neither by ancient Custome, nor Conciliar Constitution), should usurp *no authority* over one another: For which, see *Can. Apostol.* 36. — *Conc. Nicen.* c. 6. — *Conc. Ephes.* c. 8. — *Conc. Constantinop.* c. 2, 3, 5. Compared with *Conc. Chalced. Act.* 16. Which Canons, and particularly the second and third of the Second *General* Council at *Constantinople* do not prove, what some would infer; That all *Provinces* are, for all power, *absolute, supream*, and *independent*, from whom might be no further appeal; nor any other Person or Council, as Superior, take account of their Acts; for, the contrary known practice in antiquity shews this to be otherwise†: and, thus, *Provincial* Councils would have no subjection to *General*; but only signifie these two things, 1st. That neither Patriarch, nor Primate, or Metropolitan, should meddle in the affairs of any other Patriarchy, or Province, *co-ordinate*, and over which he had no Jurisdiction in such affairs: (*i. e.*) over which, neither by ancient custome, nor constitutions of Councils, he could claim any such superiority. (See the limitation, *Conc. Ephes. c.* 8. — *Quæ non prius, atque ab initio*, &c. — And *Can. Apostol.* 36. — *Quæ illi nullo jure subjecta sunt*; a clause, that is still retained in these Canons to preserve the prerogatives Patriarchal): As for example; Not the Bishops of *Alexandria* therefore to meddle with the affairs of *Antioch*—*Solius Ægypti curam gerant, servatis honoribus Ecclesiæ Antiochenæ. Servatis*; *i. e.* without encroaching upon them. Nor the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, or *Antioch*, to meddle with the Ordination of the Bishops in the several Provinces not subjected to them: Nor those of *Asia*, with those of *Thrace*; to whom *Thrace* owed no subjection. 2ly. That, in every Province, the *Provincial* Synod be the *Supream*, and *last*, Court, above any other authority *in that Province*; and exclusively to the judgment of the Bishops of any neighbouring Provinces, which are only co-ordinate with it. (See them below §. 28. called by *Gregory*, *Episcopi alieni Concilii*). For observe, that some of those Dioceses that are urged, in the former Canon || to be independent, *viz.* the Dioceses of *Thrace*, *Pontus*, and *Asia*, are, in the 16th Act of the Council of *Chalcedon*, where this very Canon was recited, mentioned to be subjected to the Patriarch of *Constantinople*; *subjected*; *i. e.* as to confirmation of their Metropolitans, and as to Appeals, see *Conc. Chalced.* Can. 9. & 16. Though still their priviledge stood firm — *Ut Episcopi Thraciæ guberment quæ* Thraciæ; namely, *unusquisque Metropolita prefatarum Dioceseum ordinet suæ Regionis Episcopos, sicut Divinis Canonibus* [(*i. e.*) the Canons of *Nice*, and these of *Constantinople*] *est præceptum.* And, as these Dioceses were subject to the Patriarch of *Constantinople*; so were others to those of *Alexandria*, and *Antioch*.

1. 2. † See §. 12, 13. || *Conc. Ephes.* c. 8.

The second necessary provision made by the Church, was, That in the Intervals of Synods, the respective *Presidents* thereof should be authorized, as standing Church-Officers, always extant, and accessible, to end controversies, interpret, and execute their Canons; since these greater Bodies could not be, so frequently as occasions might require, without much trouble, assembled†.

§. 15. n. 1. 2. †See, below, §. 16. n. 6. & 8.

As alſo leſſer cauſes were ordered to be finally terminated in ſome inferior Court, without liberty of appeal, in *all* Cauſes, by *whatever* Perſons, (which was the chief matter ſtood upon by the *Africans* againſt *Pope Bonifacius*, in the caſe of a Presbyter) from one ſuperior Court to a further; or alſo, from the ſtanding Eccleſiaſtical Officers, to a future Council; that ſo Contentions might not be unneceſſarily prolonged; nor the ſupreme Courts overcharged with buſineſs; nor Juſtice deferred. See *Conc. Milevit. c.* 22. And Card. *Bellarmin. De Rom. Pontif. l.* 2. *c.* 24. —— *Quæſtio de Appellationibus ad Romanum Pontificem non eſt de appellationibus Presbyterorum, & minorum Clericorum, ſed de appellationibus Epiſcoporum*, &c. See below, §. 16. n. 6, 8.

This in the third place (from §. 12.) of the Church's *ſubjecting* both Eccleſiaſtical Perſons, and Councils, *One* to *Another*, the leſs to the greater, in point of Judicature and Authority, for preventing of *Schiſmes*.

IV. §. 15. n. 2. 4ly. When the two Eccleſiaſtical Courts, or Officers, that are ſubordinate, do diſſent, the obedience of the *Subjects* of *both*, in ſuch caſe being once apparent, was to be rendred to the *Superior*. So, if a *Dioceſan*, or *Provincial*, Council ought to yield to a *National*, the Subjects of ſuch *Province*, or *Dioceſs*, when theſe two Councils claſh, onght to conform, in their Obedience to the *National*, not to a *Dioceſan*, or *Provincial*, Council, againſt it.

§. 16. n. 1. Now, for ſuch a ſubordination of the ſeveral Church-Officers, and Synods forenamed; and for Obedience, when theſe diſſent, due to the Superior; (the two points laſt mentioned). I will, to ſave the labour of further proof, give you the *Conceſſions* of Learned *Proteſtants*; (though this be done with ſome limitations, accommodated to the better legitimating of their *Reformation*; of which limitations, ſee below, §. 16. n. 4. --& n. 7. and again, §. 28.); deſiring you alſo to peruſe thoſe ſet down already to the ſame purpoſe, in the *ſecond Diſcourſe*. §. 24. n. 1. *&c.*

Of this matter, then, thus Dr. *Ferne*, in the *Caſe* between the Church of *England*, and *Rome*, p. 48.---*The Church of Chriſt is a ſociety, or company, under a Regiment, Diſcipline, Government; and the Members, conſtituting that Society, are either Perſons taught, guided, governed, or Perſons teaching, guiding, governing; and this, in order to preſerve all in unity, and to advance every Member of this viſible Society, to an effectual, and real participation of Grace, and Union with Chriſt the Head; and therefore, and upon no leſs account, is obedience due unto them*, Eph. 4. 11, 12, 13, 16. *and*, Heb. 13. 17. *And he, that will not hear the Church, is to be as a Heathen, and a Publican*, Mat. 18. And, applying this to the *Presbyterians*, and other Sects, dividing from the Engliſh Biſhops; and Synods ‖ --*They have incurred* (ſaith he) *by leaving us* (*and I wiſh they would ſadly conſider it*) *no leſs, than the guilt of Schiſme; which lies heavily on as many, as have* (*of what perſwaſion, or Sect, ſoever*) *wilfully divided themſelves from the communion of the Church of* England; *whether they do this by a bare ſeparation; or by adding violence, and Sacriledge unto it.*

‖ p. 46.

And

And this Dr. *Hammond*, somewhat more distinctly in his Book *of Schism*, §. 16. n. 2.
c. 8. *p.* 157. — *The way* (saith he) *provided by Christ, and his Apostles, for preserving the Unity of the Faith*, &c *in the Church, is fully acknowledged by us— made up of two acts of Apostolical Providence*; 1st. *Their resolving*, &c. 2. *Their establishing an excellent subordination of all inferior Officers of the Church to the Bishops in every City*; *of the Bishops in every Province to their Metropolitans*; *of the Metropolitans in every Region or Diocess, to Patriarchs, or Primates*; *allowing also, among these, such a primacy of Order, or Dignity, as might be proportionable to the πρῶτος τῶν in Scripture and agreeable to what is, by the ancient Canons, allowed to the Bishop of* Rome, *and this standing subordination sufficient for all ordinary uses. And when there should be need of extraordinary remedies, there was, then, a supply to be had by congregating Councils Provincial, Patriarchal, General.* Again, *Ib. c.* 3. he declares Schism in withdrawing obedience from any of these; beginning at the lowest, and so ascending to the highest:— *Those Brethren, or People* (saith he ‖) *which reject the Ministry of the Deacons,* ‖ §. 7.
or Presbyters, in any thing wherein they are ordained, or appointed by the Bishop, (and as long as they continue in obedience to him); and of their own accord break off, and separate from them, refuse to live regularly under them, they are, by the ancient Church of Christ, adjudged, and looked on as Schismaticks.— † *In like manner*; † §. 8.
if we ascend to the next higher Link; that of the Bishop, to whom both Presbyters, and Deacons, as well as the Brethren, or People, are obliged to live in obedience, the withdrawing, or denying this obedience, in any of these, will certainly fall under this guilt.

Next, for the higher Ranks of Church-Prelates, §. 20. he goes on thus— §. 16. n. 3.
It is manifest, That as the several Bishops had prefecture over their several Churches, and over the Presbyters, Deacons, and People, under them, such as could not be cast off by any, without the guilt, and brand of Schisme; *so the Bishops themselves of the ordinary inferior Cities (for the preserving of unity, and many other good uses), were subjected to the higher power of Archbishops or Metropolitans* [he having shewed, in §. 11. 12. the first Institution thereof Apostolical, in *Titus*, and *Timothy*] *nay, we must yet ascend* (saith he) *one degree higher: from this of Archbishops, or Metropolitans, to that supreme of Primates or Patriarchs,* [Concerning whose authority, having produced several Canons of Councils, §. 25. he concludes thus] — *All these Canons, or Councils, deduce this power of Primates over their own Bishops, from the Apostles, and first Planters of the Churches*; *wherein that which is pertinent to this place is only this*; *that there may be a disobedience, and irregularity, and so, a* Schism, *even in the Bishops in respect of their Metropolitans, and of the authority, which these have by Canon, and Primitive Custome, over them.* And the obedience due to these several ranks of Ecclesiastical Superiors, he affirms also due, on the same, account, to their several Synods. †† *Answ. to Catholick Gent. c.* 3. *p.* 29.
— *It is evident* (saith he), *That the power, which severally belongs to the Bishops is united in that of a Council, where these Bishops are assembled*; *and the despising of that* [Council] *is an offence under the first sort of Schism — and a despising of all ranks of our Ecclesiastical Superiors, whereof it is compounded.*

Thus Dr. *Hammond*: aſcending in theſe ſubordinations as high, as *Primates*.

§. 16. n. 4. But Dr. *Field*, Biſhop *Bramhal*, and others, riſe one ſtep higher, to the *Proto-Primates*, or *Patriarchs*, κατ' ἐξοχὴν ſo called, and their Councils. And ſtrange it is (if it were not from an engagement to the preſent *Engliſh* Intereſt) that Dr. *Hammond* could paſs by theſe, in his ſpeaking of the remedies of Schiſm, with ſo much ſilence, (not mentioning *Patriarchs*, but only as taken for *Primates*; or their Councils. See * *Anſw. to Cathol. Gent. c.* 3. n. 9, 10, 11. Where he ſpeaks of the authority of *Provincial*, *National*, *Oecumenical*, Councils, but paſſeth by *Patriarchal*; and, * *Schiſm*; p. 158, where he names *Provincial*, *Patriarchal*, *General*, but uſeth *Patriarchal* there for *National*, or the Council preſided-in by the *Primate*, to which *Primate* ſometimes was applied the name of *Patriarch*): *Strange*, I ſay, conſidering not only the clear evidence of ancient Conſtitutions, and practice, relating to theſe *Patriarchs*, and their *Synods*; but the great neceſſity thereof, as to the *Unity* of the Church's *Faith*, and Conſervation of her *Peace*; and that much more, ſince the diviſion of the Empire into ſo many Kingdoms; by reaſon of which ſecular contrary Intereſts, the ſeveral parts, and members of the Catholick Church, diſperſed amongſt them, are more ſubject to be disjointed, and ſeparated, from one another. Which unity and peace, (if we reflect on * the great rarity of *General Councils* (not above five, or ſix, in the *Proteſtant* account, in 1600. years) and * the multiplicity of *Primates* that are in Chriſtendom, all left by Dr. *Hammond* Supreme, and independent, on one another; or on any other perſon, or Council, when a *General* one not in being; and * the experience of their frequent Lapſes into groſs Errors: (For almoſt what great *Hereſie*, or *Schiſm*, hath there been in the Church, whereof ſome *Primate* was not a chief Abettor?) and * The Rents in the Church, made by theſe, apt to be much greater, as the perſon is higher, and more powerful), is not ſufficiently provided-for, though much pretended, in Dr. *Hammond's* Scheme.

§. 16. n. 5. Come we then to Dr. *Field's* Model yet more enlarged: --- *The actions* (ſaith he ‖) *of the Biſhop of each particular Church of a City, and places adjoining, were ſubject to the cenſure, and judgment of the reſt of the Biſhops of the ſame Province; amongſt whom, for order ſake, there was one Chief; to whom it pertained to call them together; to ſit as Moderator in the midſt of them, being aſſembled; and to execute what by joint conſent they reſolved on. The actions of the Biſhops of a Province, and of a Provincial Synod conſiſting of theſe Biſhops, were ſubject to a Synod conſiſting of the Metropolitans, and other Biſhops of divers Provinces. This Synod was of two ſorts. For, either it conſiſted of the Metropolitans, and Biſhops of one Kingdome, and Nation only, as did the Councils of* Africa; *or of the Metropolitans, and Biſhops of many Kingdoms. If of the Metropolitans, and Biſhops of one Kingdome, and State only, the chief* Primate *was Moderator*: *If of many, one of the* Patriarchs, *and chief Biſhops of the whole world* [was Moderator]: *every Church being ſubordinate to ſome one of the* Patriarchal *Churches, and incorporate into*

‖ *Of the Chur.* p. 513.

into the Unity of it. Here you see that roundly confest, which Dr. *Hammond* conceal'd. Again, *Ib.* p. 668. --- *It is evident, That there is a power in Bishops, Metropolitans, Primates, and Patriarchs, to call Episcopal, Provincial, National and Patriarchal Synods*; [Synods *Patriarchal* answering to *Patriarchs*: National to *Primates*] *and that neither so depending of, nor subject to, the power of Princes, but that, when they are enemies to the Faith, they may exercise the same without their consent, and privity, and subject them, that refuse to obey their Summons, to such punishments, as the Canons of the Church do prescribe in cases of such contempt, or wilful negligence.* --- And, *Ib.* p. 557. --- *That the decrees of* Popes, *made with the consent, and joint concurrence of the other* Western *Bishops, did bind the* Western *Provinces, that are subject to him, as* Patriarch *of the* West. Bind them so, as that these had no liberty to *contradict* the judgment of the *Patriarch*, and this Council: for which see *Ib. c.* 39. *p.* 563. where he quotes the Emperor's Law, (*Novel.* 123. *c.* 22. ---- *Patriarcha Dioceseos illius hanc causæ præbeat finem, nullâ parte ejus sententiæ* contradicere *valente*), confirming the 9th. Canon of *Conc. Chalced.* Again, *p.* 567, 568. he saith --- *That it is a Rule in Church-government; that the lesser, and inferior, may not judge the greater, and superior.* --- *That, if any Bishop have ought against his Metropolitan, he must go* (*as I shewed before*) *to the* Patriarch, *and his Synod, to complain; as to fit, and competent Judges.* --- *That the great* Patriarchs *of the Christian Church are to be judged by some other of their own rank in order before them, assisted by inferior Bishops; that the Bishop of* Rome, *as first in order among the* Patriarchs, *assisted with his own Bishops, and the Bishops of him, that is thought faulty*, [though these latter are not found always necessary, or present at such judgments; nor, more of his own Bishops, than those whom he can at such time conveniently assemble, and consult with, as appears in the Appeals of those persons named before, §. 13. n. 1.] *may judge any of the other Patriarchs; That such as have complaints against them, may fly to him, and the Synod of Bishops subject to him, and that the Patriarchs themselves, in their distresses, may fly to him, and such Synods, for relief, and help.* (See the same, *p.* 668.). Nor doth he acknowledge such an authority of Judicature in these Church-Prelates, only as joined with their Synods, but also in them single, and without them. For, since it is manifest; that the constant meeting of the *Provincial* Synods *twice*, as it was ordered at the first, or *once*, in the year, as afterward, did very early cease, either by the Clergie's neglect, or the great trouble, and charge of such Assemblies, and so later Councils accordingly appointed such Synods to be held, instead of twice yearly, once in three years (nor yet are in this well obeyed), Hence either all such Causes, and Appeals to their Superiors, still multiplied, as Christianity is increased, must be for so long a time suspended, and depending, which would be intolerable; and a quick dispatch, though less equitable, rather to be wished; or, the hearing of them must be devolved to these single standing Judges, as directed by former Church-Canons. Concerning this therefore thus the same Doctor goes on, ‖ quoting the Canons of the 6th. and 7th. Council: --- *At the first* (saith he) *there was a* Synod *of Bishops in every Province, twice in the year: But, for the misery, and poverty of such, as should travel to Synods, the Fathers of the* 6th. *Council* † *decreed it should be once* † Can. 8.

§. 16. n. 6.

‖ l. 5. p. 514.

in the year; and then things amiss to be redressed, which Canon was renewed by
1 Can. 6. *the* 7th. General *Council*‖: *But afterwards, many things falling out to hinder their happy Meetings, we shall find; that they met not so often* [and very early may this be found] *and therefore the Council of* Basil *appointed Episcopal Synods to be holden once every year, and Provincial at the least once in three years: And so, in time Causes growing many, and the difficulties intolerable, in coming together, and in staying, to hear these Causes thus multiplied, and increased, it was thought fitter to refer the hearing of complaints, and appeals, to Metropolitans, and such like Ecclesiastical Judges, limited and directed by Canons, and Imperial Laws, than to trouble the Pastors of whole Provinces, and to wrong the people by the absence of their Pastors, and Guides.* Thus He. And, if this rarer meeting of *Provincial* Synods transferred many Causes on the *Metropolitan's* sole Judicature, much more did that rarer assembling of a *Patriarchal*, or *General*, Council, leave appeals in greater Causes to the single Arbitrement of the *Patriarch* assisted with his ordinary Council, or Consistory.

§. 16. n. 7. Here, then, you see, in Dr. *Field*, the ground of a thorow Union in Christ's Church: whereas that of Dr. *Ferne*, and Dr. *Hammond*, though it served their turn for the remedy of a *Presbyterian* defection, or the extravagancies of some particular Bishop, yet afforded no standing cure (as it did concern them, it should not), for those of a *Primate*, or for any *National* Division. Only one Reservation Dr. *Field* hath in this place, perhaps with an eye to protect the *Reformation* thereby, which Dr. *Hammond*, I conceive thought it not safe to trust to.--*That the Bishops of a Province, subject to a* Metropolitan, *or the* Metropolitan, *and his Bishops, subject to a* Patriarch, *may declare in what cases he incurreth the sentence of Suspension, Excommunication, Deposition, or Degradation, pronounced by the very Law, and Canon it self; and so may withdraw themselves from his Obedience.* Thus he Where, suppose this, he would have, should be granted him, concerning a *General Council*, all of it *united* and declaring such a thing (if such a thing may be) of the *Supreme Prelate* of the Church, and *President* of this Council, because there is no Superior Person, or Court of Judicature, whereby this *President* may be tried: And also granted, concerning such proceeding against any *Subordinate* Superior, (as against the *Metropolitan*, or *Primate*) whenever he *freely confesseth*, that transgression of the Canons, which they charge him with; for, in such a case, their obedience is due not to him any longer, but to the Canons, and to his Superiors, that maintain them. But, most presumptuous, and unreasonable it seems, for *Subjects* to make any such Declaration, and withdraw Obedience, whenever such matter is in contest between them and him; and a superior person, or Court, provided to decide it; and yet more unreasonable; if a part only of the Subjects, suppose, of a *Primate*, or *Patriarch*, should declare so, when another part withstands them, and declares the contrary. And see *Can.* 10. of the 8th. *General* Council punctual against any such Declaration, or Discession, before a Judgment---*Nullus Clericus, ante Synodicam Sententiam, à communione proprii Patriarchæ se separet*, &c. *Idem de Episcopis statuimus, erga proprios Metropolitanos; similiter & de Metropolitis*

litis, circa Patriarcham ſuum. This of Dr. *Field.* See the places quoted out of Bp. *Bramhal* to the ſame purpoſe, *Diſc.* 2. §. 24. n. 1. —And *Diſc.* 1. §. 27.

The like is acknowledged at large, by the Archbiſhop of *Spalato*; and, amongſt theſe *Patriarchs*, the ſupereminent Priviledges of the firſt, or *Roman, Patriarch* (the evidences of Antiquity producing ſuch a conſent in theſe Learned men) are diſplayed by him, in his *De Repub. Eccleſ. l.* 3. *c.* 2. & 10. §. 16. n. 8. There, *c.* 2. *n.* 1. having named the other lower ſubordinations of Church-Governors, *ad vitanda Schiſmata*; he goes on --- *Ac demùm & Primatibus, & Metropolitanis, & Epiſcopis unus Patriarcha in totâ integrâ aliquâ Provinciâ, in certis ſimiliter cauſis, præſideret.* —*Et quia non ſemper adèo facile eſt Epiſcopos comprovinciales* [or *compatriarchales* much more] *in unum convenire, expediens fuit, ut Metropolitani, & Primates* [& Patriarchæ] *multa, ſoli, abſolverent, quæ Synodi abſolvere debuiſſent; eſſentq; quaſi totius Synodi Vicarii & Commiſſarii.* Further of theſe *Patriarchs* he ſaith: ‖ —*Sicut Metropolitanus Epiſcopus ſuffraganeos ſuos errantes corripere, & corrigere debeat, & emendare; ita, ſi Metropolitanus erret, ſive in moribus, ſive in judiciis, & actis ſuis, ne etiam in hoc Synodus etiam ſemper, cum incommodo, conveniat, à* Patriarchis *voluit Eccleſiaſtica conſuetudo, & lex, Metropolitanos emendari; niſi tam gravis ſit cauſa, & publica, præſertim fidei, ut totius regionis Synodus, ſive & Oecumenica, debeat convenire*: Quoting the words of the 8th. *General* Council, *Can.* 17. ſaying the ſame —— *Senioris & novæ* Romæ *Præſules, &c, Metropolitanorum habeant poteſtatem, ad convocandum eos* [not this in times of Heatheniſme, but when Chriſtian Religion flouriſhed under ſecular Princes, already ſubjected to it], *urgente neceſſitate, ad Synodalem conventum, vel etiam ad coercendum illos, & corrigendum, cùm fama eos, ſuper quibuſdam delictis, forſan accuſaverit.* Further, aſcending to the *Roman Patriarch*, he thus goes on to declare his priviledges: ‖ —— *Habebat etiam* Romanus Pontifex *Patriarchalia privilegia, pallium, ſibi ſubjectis Metropolitanis illud petentibus, concedere, &c; eoſdem à lege divinâ, vel ſacris Canonibus, deviantes corripere, & in officio continere; controverſias inter eoſdem exortas componere, cauſaſq; eorundem interdum* [(*i.e.*) in cauſis gravioribus] *audire, & decidere; totius Patriarchatus Concilia convocare.*—n. 14. —*Ex loco ſui primi Patriarchatus, Sacrorum Canonum primus habebatur, & præcipuus, obſervator, cuſtos, ac vindex; quos ſi alicubi violari cognoſceret, acer monitor inſurgebat.* n. 15. —*Ad ipſum quicunque Epiſcopi cujuſcunq; provinciæ, & regionis,* [not only of his Patriarchy] *qui ſe ab Epiſcopis propriæ provinciæ gravari ſentirent, & in judiciis Eccleſiaſticis tanquam ad ſacram anchoram, confugerent, apud ipſum innocentiam ſuam probaturi* —*Romani Pontifices de facto eos ſedibus ſuis reſtituebant, & ab objectis criminibus, tanquam ſi eſſent ſupremi judices, abſolvebant* [and this ſo anciently as *Cyprian's* time, and before the firſt *General* Council of *Nice*] n. 16. —*Ille, propter ſummam ipſius exiſtimationem, commune quaſi vinculum, & nodus erat præcipuus Catholicæ Communionis in totâ Eccleſiâ.* --*Catholicæ Communionis dux, & arbiter, ut cui ipſe ſuam communionem vel daret, vel adimeret, cætera quaq; Eccleſiæ omnes ordinariè darent pariter, vel adimerent.* So *Spalatenſis.* §. 16. n. 9.

Mr. *Thorndike*, firſt in general, ſaith † —*That the Soul of the* Viſible Unity † *Juſt weighty* of P. 41.

of the Church *consisteth in the resort of inferior Churches to superior* [of which he discourseth more largely, in *Rights of the Church*, c. 2.] *and in the correspondence of* Parallel-Churches.---*That the Church, so stated is a standing Synod, able, by consent of the chief Churches containing the consent of their resorts,* [*i. e.* of the inferior Churches resorting to them] *to conclude the whole. That* Rome, Alexandria, Antiochia, *were from the beginning of Christianity, visible Heads of these great Resorts in Church-Government; which the Council of* Nice *made subject to them, by Canon-Law, for the future* ‖, *our British Church not excepted* †. And, more particularly, in justifying the Authority of the *Roman Patriarch*, and the Canons of *Sardica*, concerning Appeals to him.---*Shall I not ask* (saith he) *what pretence there could be to settle from other parts Appeals to* Rome, *rather than from* Rome *to other parts, had not a preeminence of power, and not only a precedence of Rank been acknowledged originally in the Church of* Rome? And, before, speaking of the *Eastern Arrians* desiring to be heard at *Rome*, by *Julius*: --*Shall I believe* (saith he) *as some Learned men* [*i. e.* Protestants] *conjecture; That Pope* Julius *is meerly an Arbitrator, named by one party, whom the other could not refuse; and that any Bishop, or at least any Primate, might have been named, and must have been admitted, as well as he? Truly I cannot.* Thus Mr. *Thorndike*. I fear I have tired you with the same things so often repeated by several Authors, but this may serve the more to confirm the verity of that, wherein they agree. As for the *Obedience* acknowledged by them due to the *Church*, according to these *Subordinations*, I shall have occasion to give you a further account of it hereafter.

‖ p. 39.
† p. 40.

§. 17. Now, this subordination, not only of the lower Ranks of Clergy, *Presbyters*, and *Bishops*, of the same, but of these higher, *Primates*, and *Patriarchs*, of several, Nations, ending its ascent in a Primacy, not of order (ineffective) but also of Power, placed in the *Prime Patriarch*, especially conduceth to the necessary coherence of the always *one-only-Communion* of the Church *Catholick*, and to the suppression of Heresies, and Schismes, oftner *National*, than *Diocesan* only, or *Provincial*.

§. 18. A thing, which the moderate spirit of *Grotius* well observed, and spared not often to speak of---*Qua verò est causa,* (saith he in his first Reply to *Rivet* ‖) *cur, qui opinionibus dissident inter Catholicos, maneant in eodem corpore, non ruptâ Communione; contra, qui inter Protestantes dissident, idem facere nequeant, utcunq; multa de dilectione fraternâ loquuntur? Hoc qui rectè expenderit, inveniet, quanta sit vis Primatus.* [which brings to mind that of S. *Jerom* †, concerning S. *Peter's* Primacy--*Propterea inter duodecim unus eligitur, ut, capite constituto, Schismatum tollatur occasio. Capite constituto*; but Primacy of *Order*, without power, helps no schisms.] And again, the same *Grotius* in the close of the last Reply to *Rivet* † written not long before his death;--*Restitutionem Christianorum in unum idemq; Corpus, semper optatam à* Grotio, *sciunt, qui eum norunt. Existimavit autem aliquando, incipi posse à* Protestantium *inter se conjunctione. Postea vidit, Id planè fieri nequire; quia, praterquam quod Calvinistarum ingenia fermè omnium ab omni pace sunt alienissima,* Protestantes *nul-*

‖ *Ad Art.* 7.
† *Adversus Jovin. l.* 1. *c.* 14.
‖ *Apol. Discussio. p.* 255.

lo

lo inter se communi Ecclesiastico regimine sociantur; quæ causa sunt, cur falta partes in unum Protestantium *corpus colligi nequeant; immò & cur partes aliæ atque aliæ sint exsurrecturæ. Quare nunc planè ita sentit* Grotius, *& multi cum ipso, non posse* Protestantes *inter se jungi, nisi simul jungantur cum iis, qui* Sedi Romanæ *cohærent; sine quâ nullum sperari potest in Ecclesiâ commune Regimen: Ideo optat, ut ea divulsio, quæ evenit, & causa divulsionis tollantur. Inter eas causas non est* Primatus Episcopi Romani *secundum Canonas, fatente* Melancthone; *qui eum* Primatum *etiam necessarium putat ad retinendam unitatem.* Thus *Grotius.* Which passage is taken notice of by Dr. *Hammond*, in *Schism*, p. 158, and seemingly allowed: the Doctor, there, seeming to admit the *Pope's* authority so far, as it is justifiable by the ancient Canons; which authority, you have seen how far it is, by other *Protestants*, out of the same Canons, advanced.

And indeed, to exclude this *supream Patriarchal* authority, and constitute such an Aristocratical, or rather, so many several Monarchical, absolute, equal, independent, Governments (in regard of any spiritual Superior) as there are *Primates*, (*several Monarchical Governments*, I say; for the *Aristocratical* Government consists in one Council or Court, having its constant, and set Meetings, such as are not those Meetings of the Highest Ecclesiastical Synods, and therefore they cannot bear this Stile) seems most destructive of the Church's *Unity*, and *Peace*; And then, to make amends for this, the subjecting all these distinct Monarchical Governments to a *General Council*, proves no sufficient Remedy; when we reflect, how many and frequent are Clergy-differences; how few such Councils have hitherto been; how difficult such a Council, since the Division of the *Empire*, to be convened; or rather, how impossible, according to the *Protestant's* Composition of it; who, as they frequently appeal to it; so load it with such conditions, as, they may be sure, such Court can never meet to hear their Cause. Thus much is contributed by Learned *Protestants* toward the confirmation of the two last, the 3d. and 4th. *Constitutions*. §. 19.

5ly. After such a *Regular*, and *well-compacted* Government, thus settled in the Church, Next, it was strictly ordered, by the Church-Laws, and by her greatest Censures imposed on Delinquents; That no *Clergy*, in any matters of *meerly Spiritual* Concernment, should decline the Authority, or Judgment, of these their Ecclesiastical Superiors, or their subjection to the Church-Canons, by repairing, or appealing, to any *secular* Tribunal, (from which Tribunals some in those days sought relief); either that of other inferior Lay-Magistrates, or, of the *Emperor* himself; nor should seek new Ecclesiastical Dignities erected by the *Emperor's Pragmatick*, contrary to the Canons. Decreed also it was; That, in such case, any Church-authority, or priviledges, attempted to be so alienated, should still continue to the former Possessors. For which, see *Conc. Antioch. c.* 11, 12. --- *Cons Sardic. c.* 8. --- *Conc. Chalced. c.* 9, & 12. --- *Conc. Milevit. c.* 19. --- *Conc. Telet.* 3. *c.* 13. --- 8 *Gen. Conc. c.* 17, & 21. §. 20.

Which

§. 21. Which *Eccleſiaſtical* Conſtitutions, that they may appear no way unjuſt; or infringing the Rights of *Temporal* Soveraignty; It is to be noted, (and therefore give me leave to ſpend a few lines in the Illuſtration of it, becauſe it ſeems very pertinent to the matter in hand); That the *Church*, from the beginning, was conſtituted by our Lord, a diſtinct Body from the *Civil State*: and is, in all ſuch *States*, but one viſible Society, (*Credo unam Catholicam Eccleſiam*); all the parts of it having one, and the ſame intereſt, through thoſe ſeveral Dominions, and regulated, within theſe Territories, by its own Laws (without which Laws no Communion can conſiſt) independently, as to matters *purely ſpiritual*, on the *State*; and the exerciſe of theſe not lawfully to be inhibited, or altered by it; whilſt all the Civil Rights of ſuch *States*, mean-while, do remain unviolated by theſe *Church-Laws*; and the ſecular Sword is left, where it was before, in the hand of the Secular Governors; ſo that, the Church, in any difference, cannot be the *invading*, but only the *Suffering*, party.

§. 22. Now, if you would know more particularly, what thoſe *Rights* are, which the *Church* hath, from the beginning, practiſed, and vindicated, as belonging to her independently, and notwithſtanding any oppoſition, of the Secular Powers, Theſe are ſome, if not the chief of them: * Namely, The entrance of theſe *Miniſters of Chriſt*, without Arms, into whatever *Prince's* Dominions; and their preaching there the *Goſpel* of *Chriſt*, and adminiſtring the *Sacraments* to his Subjects, though againſt his *Prohibition*. * *Determining Controverſies* ariſing in matters of Faith, and Religion; and *publiſhing* ſuch their Determinations to all the Church's Subjects within any *Prince's* Realms. * Making *Eccleſiaſtical Laws* for Government, and Diſcipline, as need requires. * Receiving *Accuſations*, examining *Witneſſes*, correcting *Offenders*, againſt the Laws of *Chriſt*, or of the *Church*: [I do not name here, the Church's judging of *Civil* Cauſes between Chriſtians, (though this a thing moſt uſual, when the *Princes*, and their Courts were Heathen); becauſe this is a Right of the *Prince* to judge all ſuch Cauſes, when brought before him: and, on that account, the practice thereof did return to the *Prince*, when *Chriſtian*; when it had been diſuſed before, only becauſe *Chriſtians*, in any conteſt, choſe rather, or alſo were enjoined (it being a thing not only lawful, but in thoſe times, very expedient, for them) to ſtand to the Arbitration of their Eccleſiaſtical Governors, than to go to the trial of the Civil Law, and Secular Magiſtrate.] * Declaring *Hereſie*; *ſuſpending* criminous ſinners from the *Sacrament*: Impoſing *Penances*; Reconciling Penitents; and *Excommunicating*, and caſting out of the Church the incorrigible, and obſtinate: * *Ordaining Church-Officers* in a due Subordination, with a ſtrict dependance of the lower, upon the higher, *Clergy*; ſo that an Eccleſiaſtical Function is unlawfully exerciſed by the one, if he enter upon it without the conſent, or confirmation of the other; (and that, not only of *Presbyters* without the *Biſhops*; and of *Biſhops*, without the *Metropolitans*, or *Primates*; but of *Primates* themſelves alſo, without the *Patriarchs*: as hath been ſhewed). * Holding Religious Aſſemblies, both for the *Publick Service* of God, and for the forementioned *Church-Affairs*

fairs. And, for this again, the reſpective Superiors *Calling*, and appointing theſe Meetings in certain places, and times; which alſo muſt be within the Territories of ſome ſecular Prince: only all theſe things done by *Lawful*, and *Canonical*, Eccleſiaſtical Superiors, without *Arms* (unleſs it be thoſe of the *Prince* for their protection) and in order to ends *purely ſpiritual*: In which proceedings therefore they remain queſtionable, and to be reſtrained by the ſame Temporal Authority, when, in any exceeding of ſuch limits, found to tranſgreſs.

All theſe things were practiſed by the *Church* in the *Apoſtle's* times, (See for ſeveral of them, 1 *Tim.* 5. 19, 20, 21. —— *Tit.* 1. 10, 11, 13. —— 1 *Cor.* 5. 4, 5, 12, 13. —— 4. 19, 21. —— 3 *John* 9. 10. —— *Mat.* 18. 17, 18, 20. and their holding a *Council* at *Jeruſalem*, Act. 15.) and in the Primitive times, before *Conſtantine*, though the ſecular Powers (as yet Heathen), oppoſed, prohibited, executed, the chief Actors of them: and therefore much more, they may be continued, and acted by the ſame Authority, when *Princes*, for the gaining of eternal Crowns, have ſubjected their mortal ones to *Chriſtianity*, and are become *Sons* of the *Church*; who, ſurely, by bringing in their perſons under her obedience, do not gain any ſuch new Soveraignty over her, as by this to take away thoſe former Rights, which Heathen Potentates could not juſtly deny, or withhold from, her. §. 23.

For, note here, That whatever Prerogative, or Priviledge, is challenged by a *Chriſtian Prince*, as naturally belonging to the *Civil* Power, cannot be denied alſo to an *Infidel*, or *Heathen*, *Prince*, when poſſeſſed of the ſame power; [For example, If a *Chriſtian* Prince may lawfully reſtrain the Biſhops, his Subjects, from meeting in Synods, from executing the Church-Canons, or publiſhing their definitions in matter of Doctrine, (I mean ſuch as no way concern the State) within his Realm, without his leave, upon this account, becauſe he is the Politick Supreme; ſo may a *Heathen*, as having the very ſame Title to do it]. And therefore none ſuch muſt be haſtily challenged by the one, which, if exerciſed by the other, would both have ruined the Government of the Primitive *Church*, and rendered its ordinary practice guilty of a moſt high Rebellion. If theſe *Chriſtian Princes*, therefore, now aſſiſt the *Church* to call her *Councils*, if they adopt her Canons amongſt their Laws, and uſe their ſecular ſword (much more effective, and dreaded by many, for the preſent, than her Spiritual one) to force their Subjects, and her's, to a more ready obedience to her Laws; we may not therefore argue her former power is now loſt, for calling *Councils*; or, for executing her Canons; unleſs theſe firſt be made alſo their Laws, becauſe a ſecularly-ſtronger Power is joined with her's, for the more advancing the ſame effect; and hence perhaps, to ſome, may ſeem to ecclipſe Her's. But, though, in ſuch a Conjunction, the *Prince's* Authority ſeems to have the ſtronger influence on Church-affairs, yet, ſo often as any ſuch *Prince*, in Profeſſion, Chriſtian, but addicted to ſome Faction apart, withdraws ſuch aſſiſtance from his true Mother, and leaves Her again, as the Heathen *Princes* did, deſtitute of his aid, or alſo reſtrained with his Interdicts, ſo often ſhe is forced to renew the Church's former behaviour in

the Heathen times; and goes on acting the ſame things ſingly by her ſelf, armed only with that ſword of Juſtice, which *Chriſt* hath put into her hands, of ſhutting the Rebellious out of the Kingdome of Heaven. Elſe, if we ſuppoſe any one Branch of the former Church-Authority, in ſuch a caſe as this, to be loſt by the *Prince's* being *Chriſtian*, any Heretical *Prince* will now have the ſame power to ruine the Orthodox, and Catholick Religion within his Territories, as a *Heathen Prince* would then have had, to deſtroy the *Chriſtian*.

§. 24. As you may eaſily diſcern, if you will ſuppoſe ſuch a *Prince* as *Conſtantius*, one that profeſſeth *Arianiſme*, to claim, as being a *Chriſtian Prince*, the exerciſing of ſome of thoſe Powers forementioned, which were managed by the *Church* herſelf before the times of *Conſtantine*. Namely; a Power. * To *change* the *Subordinations* of the Eccleſiaſtical Authority, eſtabliſhed by the Church; to *tranſlate Patriarchs*, or erect *new ones*, and to free the *Primates* (ſuch as the *Arian*) from *obedience* to *Them*, and their *Synods*; to introduce *new* Clergy, or depoſe the former, as to the Function of their Office in any place of his Dominions; when yet theſe no way obnoxious to ſecular Juſtice for tranſgreſſing his Civil Laws (in which caſe, ſhould the *Prince* deprive any ſuch *Clergy* of life, or liberty, as *Salomon* did *Abiathar*, yet the *Clergy*, not the *Prince*, is to ſupply another): and all this, without there reſpective Eccleſiaſtical Superior's conſent, and allowance. —— * To hinder the *Calling* of Eccleſiaſtical Synods, without his Conſent, as a thing rightly appertaining to him, and other *Chriſtian Princes*, not them, the Church-men. —— * Or, theſe called, at leaſt to hinder *his Clergy* from aſſiſting there; and to deny their Decrees obligatory, at leaſt, within the Circuit of his Government. —— * When Synods are aſſembled in his own Territories, and with his leave, To hinder their making any definitions, in ſpiritual matters, or, publiſhing them within his Dominions, without their being firſt evidenced to him, to be in nothing repugnant to *God's* Word, (a thing he is to learn of them), and without his conſent firſt obtained; whereby he aſſumes to himſelf, in the *Church's* Conſults, a negative voice. --- * To hinder alſo the execution of the *Church's* former Canons in his Territories, ſo long as theſe not admitted amongſt his Laws. --- * Again, when ſome former Church-Doctrine ſeems to Him to vary from God's Truth; or ſome Canon of the *Church* to reſtrain the juſt liberty of his Subjects, I mean, as to ſpiritual matters, then either Himſelf, and Council of *State*, againſt all the *Clergy*; or joined with ſome *ſmaller* part of the *Clergy* of his own Kingdom, againſt a much *major* part; or joined with the *whole* Clergy of his own Dominions, againſt a *Superior* Council, to *make Reformations* herein, as is by them thought fit. —— * Laſtly, To prohibit the entrance of any *Clergy*, ſave ſuch as is *Arian*; into his Kingdom, under a Capital puniſhment; who ſees not, that ſuch an *Arian Prince*, juſtified in the exerciſe of any ſuch power, and, ſo the *Church* obliged to ſubmit to it, muſt needs, within the circuit of his Command, overthrow the *Catholick Religion*; and that the *neceſſary* means of continuing, there, the truth of the *Goſpel* is withdrawn from the *Church*. And the ſame it would be here, if the *Clergy*, within ſuch a Dominion, ſhould, upon any pretended cauſe, declare themſelves

ſelves freed from obedience to their Eccleſiaſtical Superiors; or, by I know not what priviledge, tranſlate their Superior's Authority to the *Prince*.

Many of theſe *Juriſdictions*, vindicated by the *Church*, are ſo clearly due to her, for the ſubſiſtence of true Religion, as that ſeveral paſſages in many *Learned Proteſtants* ſeem to join with *Catholicks* in the defence of them, of which I ſhall give you a large view in another Diſcourſe. Mean-while ſee that of Dr. *Field*, quoted below, §. 49. and, at your leiſure, Mr. *Thorndike's* Treatiſe of the *Rights of the Church*, in a Chriſtian State; and Bp. *Carleton's*, of *Juriſdiction Regal*, and *Epiſcopal*. In the laſt place, then, this Bar was ſet by the Church, againſt any *Clergie's* making uſe of the *Secular* Power, for remitting their *Subjection* to the Laws and Conſtitutions of their *Eccleſiaſtical* Superiors; or for poſſeſſing themſelves of any Eccleſiaſtical *Dignities*, or *Juriſdictions*, contrary to the Church's *Canons*. §. 25.

Now then, to ſum together all that hath been ſaid of theſe *Subordinations* of *Clergy*, *Perſons*, and *Councils* (ſo high as the *Patriarchal*), for preſerving a perpetual unity in the *Church*; §. 26.

[1] First, No *Introduction*, or *Ordination*, of inferiour Clergy could any where be made without the approbation, or confirmation, of the Superior.

[2] The ſeveral *Councils*, were to be *called*, when need required, and to be *moderated*, by their reſpective Eccleſiaſtical *Superiors*, and matters of more general concernment, there, not to be paſſed by the Council, without his conſent: nor by him, without their's, or the major part of them. §. 27.

[3] All *differences* about Doctrine, Manners, or Diſcipline, ariſing amongſt inferiour perſons, or Councils, were to be decided by their *Superiors*, till we come to the higheſt of theſe, the *Patriarchal* Council. And, in the Intervals of Councils, the reſpective *Prelates*, and *Preſidents* thereof, were to take care of the *Execution* of their Canons, as alſo, to receive and decide *appeals* in ſuch matters, for which it was thought not ſo neceſſary to convene a Synod, amongſt which, the differences with, or between, *Primates*, were to be decided by the *Patriarch*; thoſe with, or between, Patriarchs, by the *Proto-Patriarch*; aſſiſted with ſuch a *Council*, as might with convenience be procured. §. 28.

[4] In claſhing between any Inferior, and Superior, Authority, when theſe commanded ſeveral things, the Subjects of both were to adhere, and ſubmit, to the Judgment, and Sentence of the *Superior*. §. 29.

[5] All theſe things were to be tranſacted in the Church, concerning *cauſes* purely *Eccleſiaſtical*, and Spiritual, without the controulment of, or appeal to, any *ſecular Judges*, or Courts, under penalty of excommunication to the *Clergy*, ſo appealing. §. 30.

Now, in ſuch a well,—and cloſe-woven Series of dependence, what entrance can there be for pretended *Reformations* by Inferiors againſt the higher Eccleſiaſtical Powers, without incurring *Schiſm*? Whether of, I know not what, *Independents*, *Fanaticks*, and *Quakers*, againſt *Presbyters*; or, of *Presbyters* againſt *Biſhops* (Reformations which the Church of *England* hath a long time deplored); or, of *Biſhops* againſt the *Metropolitan*; and ſo up to the *Prime* §. 31.

§. 32. *Patriarch*, the ſupreme Governour in the Church of *Chriſt*. And next: What *degree* of obedience can be deviſed leſs (I ſpeak, as to the determinations of matters of Doctrine), than a *non-contradicting* of the judgment of theſe *Superiors*? Which obedience only had it been yielded by the firſt *Reformers*, whatever more perhaps might have been juſtly demanded of them by the *Church*, yet thus had the door been ſhut againſt all entring in of *Controverſie* in matters of Religion once defined: And, though ſome ſtill might themſelves wander out of its Pale; yet, in their forbearing Diſputes, the reſt of the Church's Subjects would have ſlept quietly in her boſome, unaſſaulted, and ſo unſwayed, with their *new* Tenents. And perhaps thoſe others alſo in time have been made aſhamed of their own *ſingularity*, when they were debarred of this means of gaining Followers, and making themſelves *Captains* of a *Sect*.

§. 33.

CHAP. III.

Of Councils General.

1. *The neceſſary Compoſition of them, conſidered with relation to the acceptation of them by Abſents.* §. 35.
   This Acceptation in what meaſure requiſite. §. 39.
2. *To whom belongs the* Preſidentſhip *in theſe* Councils. §. 45.
3. *And*, Calling *of them.* §. 47.

§. 34. THis (from §. 9.) ſaid of all inferiour Perſons, and Councils, and their Preſidents, ſo high as a *Patriarchal*: of their ſeveral Subordinations, and Obedience, in any diſſent, due ſtill to the ſuperiour Court, or Prelate, Now I come to the ſupreme Council, *Oecumenical*, or *General*, (the Rules and Laws of which may be partly collected from the former). Wherein the chief Conſiderables are; [1] The *Compoſition*; of what, or what number of perſons it muſt neceſſarily conſiſt: [2] The *Preſidentſhip* in it; and the *Calling* of it; to whom they belong.

§. 35. 1ſt. Then, for the *Compoſition*; It is neceſſary, that it be ſuch, either wherein all the *Patriarchs*, (or, at leaſt, ſo many of them as are *Catholick*) with many of their Biſhops, do meet in perſon; or where, after All called to It, and the Biſhops of ſo many Provinces, as can well be convened, ſitting in Council, headed by the *Prime Patriarch*, or his Legates, Delegates are ſent by the reſt; or, at leaſt, the Acts, and Decrees thereof, in their neceſſary abſence, are accepted, and approved by them, and by the ſeveral Provinces under them; or, by the major part of thoſe Provinces.

§. 36. For, a *General*, or *Oecumenical*, Council, ſuch as doth conſiſt of *all* the *Biſhops* of the *Catholick* Univerſe, met together, there never hath been any; but,

but, in those which are generally, by *Protestants*, as well as *Catholicks*, reputed, and admitted for such, sometimes we find a greater, sometimes a smaller, number, according to the propinquity of the place, the peace of the times, the numerosity of Sects, *&c.* So the four first *General* Councils all held in the *East*, by reason of the Heresies, they opposed, chiefly reigning in that Coast, consisted mostly of *Oriental* Bishops. The first *General* Council, of *Nice*, had present in it only two Presbyters (the Bishop of *Rome*'s Legates), and three Bishops of the *Occidental* Churches. The 2d. *General* Council, of *Constantinople*, had in it no *Occidental* Bishop at all; but only was *confirmed* by the Bishop of *Rome*, and his *Occidental* Council assembled in *Rome*, not long after it. The 3d. *General* Council of *Ephesus*, had only three Delegates sent to it from the Bishop of *Rome*, and his *Occidental* Synod. The 4th. of *Chalcedon*, had only four Legates, sent thither from the Bishop of *Rome*; after that the *Western* Bishops, assembled in several *Provincial* Synods, had commnnicated their judgment to them, in the Controverfie then agitated; and, besides these, two *African* Bishops, and one *Sicilian*. Where note; That the 3d, also, of these Councils transacted most of their business, and condemned *Nestorius* the Bishop of *Constantinople*, without the presence of the *Antiochian* Patriarch, and his Bishops, who retarded his journy in favor of *Nestorius*, (though afterwards he, and his, consented also to his Condemnation):

And that the 4th. Council acted all things, without *Dioscorus*, the *Alexandrian* Patriarch; whom also they deposed, for his favouring the Heretical Party; and for his Contumacy against the *See* of *Rome*. See *Conc. Chalced.* Act. 3. 4.

§. 37.

Yet all these Councils, whether the Bishops personally present, were fewer, or more, were accounted *equally* valid; from the *After-Acceptation*, and admittance of their Decrees by the *Prelates* absent; *i. e.* the acceptation of such persons, as, if present, had had a Vote in them. *All* which *Prelates*, were they personally present in the Council, or the *much major* part of them, there would be no further need of any approbation of the Church Catholick, or, of any other Members thereof, to confirm its acts; nor are they any way capable thereof; because the remainder of the Church diffusive (I mean of those, who have any decisive vote in Ecclesiastical affairs) must be concluded, in their Judgment, and Sentence, by this supposed *much-major* part thereof, that are *personally present* in the Council. But, this wanting, the other compleats its defect. And upon such *Acceptation* it is, that the 2d. and the 5th. of the Councils called *General*; held at *Constantinople*, without the *Pope*, or his Legat's presence therein, yet bear the name of *General*, because the Decrees of the former of them were accepted by *Damasus*, and his *Occidental* Council, convened not long after it; and the latter, after some time, accepted by *Vigilius*, and his Successors, with the *Western* Bishops; as, on the contrary, for want of such *Acceptation*, the 2d. *Ephesine* Council, though for its meeting as entire and full, as most of the other called *Oecumenical*, yet was never esteemed such, because its Decrees, though passed by a major part of the *present* Bishops, were opposed by the *Pope's* Legates in the Coun-

Council; and by Him, and the main Body of the *Occidental* Prelates, out of it.

§ 38. And, upon this General *Acceptation* also, inferior Councils may become, in their Obligation, equivalent to *General*: since, however the Church's Testimony is received; whether *conjunctly*, or *by parts*; yet—*Ecclesia universa errare non potest in necessariis.* So *Bellarmine* observes, ancient Councils, less than *General*, very frequently to have determined matters of Faith.—*Heresin* Pauli Samosateni *damnavit Concilium Antiochenum paucorum Episcoporum* (Euseb. *l.* 7. *c.* 24.): *nec alii, multò plures in toto mundo, conquesti sunt; sed ratum habuerunt*:—*Heresin* Macedonii *damnavit Concilium* Constantinopolitanum; *in quo nullus fuit Latinorum; Latini probaverunt. Heresim* Pelagii *damnaverunt Concilia* Provincialia; *Milevitanum, & Carthaginense.*—*Heresim* Nestorii *damnavit Concilium Ephesinum, antequam adessent Latini; Latini voluerunt cognoscere res gestas, & cognitas approbaverunt.* All which Determinations of lesser Councils received their strength from the *General* Body of the Church *owning* them. Neither did, or ought, such inferior Councils, when necessitated by contentions, and disputes, define any such thing, *hastily*, or *rashly*; but as they well knew, before any such Resolution, the common Sentiments of the Church *Catholick* herein. Thus the Paucity of Church-Prelates in Councils is shewed to infer a necessity of an after-Acceptation by Absents to ratifie its Acts.

De Concil. l. 2. c. 28.

§. 39. 1. Next: Concerning the just quality, measure, and proportion, of this *after-Acceptation*, several things are to be well observed. 1st. That it is not to be extended, (in a latitude of Christianity much greater), beyond the bounds of the Church *Catholick*. Which *Catholick* Church is many times of a narrower compass, than the *Christian* Profession; all *Heretical*, and *Schismatical* Churches, I mean, such as have made a former discession, in Doctrine, or external Communion, from their lawful Ecclesiastical Superiors, and, being but a part, have separated from the former whole, standing contradistinct to it. So, after the *Nicene* Council, in *Constantine's* time, the *Arians*, and, in S. *Austin's* time, the *Donatists*, were esteemed, though *Christians*, yet no *Catholicks*; and the *Catholick Church* was named still as a *part* of Christianity, opposite to them. Of which thus S. *Austin* †:—*Tenet me, justissimè, in Ecclesiæ gremio ipsum* Catholicæ *nomen, quod* [nomen], *non sine causâ, inter tam multas hæreses, sic ista Ecclesia sola obtinuit.* Therefore, upon the growth of many Heresies, after the Heathen persecutions ceased, instead of these words of the *Apostle's Creed*, [*I believe the Holy Catholick Church, the Communion of Saints*, (i. e.) *in it*] we read in this *Creed*, as explained by Councils, [*I believe One, Holy, Catholick, and Apostolick Church*:] 1. *One*, to distinguish it from *many*, varying, Sects, pretending also to be true Churches of *Christ*. 2. *Holy*; *i. e.* as to the external maintaining the true and holy Faith, Manners, Sacraments, Government, Discipline, delivered by our *Lord*, and his *Apostles*; and, in particular, *Holy*, as maintaining no Doctrine contrary to *Holiness*; but not *Holy*; so as that some *external* Members thereof

† *Contra Epist. Fund. c.* 4.

of may not be, by their own default, *internally*, unholy and unsanctified, and no true Members of *Christ*. 3. *Apostolick*; *i. e.* Succeeding them by un-interrupted Ordinations; and preserving their Traditions, for Doctrine, Government, and Discipline, And therefore here the other Clause, [*the Communion of Saints*] is omitted, as sufficiently included in the former Explication; which is observed also by Dr. *Hammond*, (of *Fundamentals*, p. 69. & 83.).

So, in the yet more enlarged, *Athanasian* Creed, we find the *Catholick* Faith used in a restrained sense, opposed to all those Heresies, that are rejected by that *Creed*. And to this notion of *Church Catholick*, see, in *Disc.* 1. §. 37. & 44. Learned *Protestants* willingly consenting.

§. 40. 2ly. This Acceptation, in respect of the *Catholick Church*, (*i. e.* of those Prelates, that be not formerly, by any Heresie, or Schisme, shut out of it,) cannot rationally be required, absolutely universal of *all*, but only of the considerably *Major* part of them; for, in a Government not simply Monarchical, whether Ecclesiastical, or Civil, no Laws can be promulgated, nor Unity preserved, if of their Governors the fewer be not regulated by a major part: and it hath been shewed at large, *Disc.* 2. §. 25. (which I desire the Reader to review, and consider well, because much weight is laid upon it) that the Decrees of the first four *General Councils* were none of them established with such a plenary acceptation: the practice of which Councils is a sufficient Rule, and Warrant to posterity: Nor, otherwise, can any new Heresie, patronized by any Bishops formerly *Catholick*, (as the most pernicious Heresies have ever been), be ever legally suppressed, so long as such Prelates persist in their dissent from the rest. See what hath been said of this in *Disc.* 1. §. 28, 38, 39.—& *Disc.* 3. §. 11, & 37. That strict condition therefore, which Dr. *Hammond* requires to authentize, and ratifie the Definitions, and Canons of *General* Councils in respect of Acceptation, seems not reasonable; Namely, *That after their promulgation* [at least, if not before] *they should be accepted by each* Provincial *Council, and acknowledged to agree with that Faith, which they had originally received* (of *Her.* §. 6. n. 8, 12.).—Or, *That such Conciliar Declarations should be universally received by all Churches*, (Her. §. 14. n. 4.): *because such are* (saith he) *Christians, and Bishops, as well as the Bishop of* Rome; *and consequently their Negatives, as evident prejudices to, and as utterly unreconcileable with, an universal Affirmative, as the* Pope's *can be*; &c. Like to which (§. 12. n. 6.) he argues thus, concerning the absence, or dissent, of any Bishops from a Council:—*That the promise, of the Gates of Hell not prevailing against the Church, can no way belong to a Council, unless all the Members of a Church were met together in a Council*; [I add, or, when met, do consent too] *for if there be any left out, why may not the promise be good in them, though the Gates of Hell should be affirmed to prevail against the Council.* And, §. 5. n. 3. —*That, if the matter delivered by a Council be not testified from all places, it is not qualified for our belief, as* Catholick, *in respect of place; because the Faith being one, and the same, and by all, and every of the Apostles, deposited in all their Plantations, what was ever really thus taught, by any of them, in any Church,*

Church, will alſo be found to have been taught, and received, in all other Apoſtolical *Churches.* And, §. 10. n. 2, 3. He concludes the Canon of the 7th. *General* Council not obliging; — *becauſe the contrary Doctrine being delivered before in a* Provincial *Council, that of* Eliberis, [which is not true], *yields* (ſaith he) *an irrefragable proof, that the Doctrine of the* 2d. Nicene *Council, was not teſtified, by all the Churches, of all ages, to be of Tradition Apoſtolical.* I ſay, ſuch an univerſal acceptation as this, of every Church, or Province, ſeems upon any ſuch pretence, unreaſonably exacted.

1ſt. Becauſe all Conciliary Definitions are not (as he ſaith there they are) only Declarations, and Teſtifications of ſuch *Apoſtolical* Traditions, as were left by them evident, and conſpicuous, in all Chriſtian Churches planted by them; but are, many times, Determinations of points deduced from, and neceſſarily conſequential to, ſuch clear Traditionals, whether written, or unwritten.

2ly. Becauſe, if the Acts of *General* Councils were only ſuch *Declarations* of *Apoſtolical* Tradition, yet, it is poſſible, that ſome particular Church may, in time, depart from ſuch a Tradition, entruſted unto them: (elſe how can any Church become Heretical, againſt any ſuch Tradition?) and ſo, when their acceptance is asked, may refuſe to acknowledge, what all the reſt juſtifie. And all this clearly appears in thoſe *Biſhops*, or *Churches*, that made ſome oppoſition to the Decrees of the four firſt *General* Councils; and in the oppoſition of S. *Cyprian*, and his Biſhops, concerning *Rebaptization.*

§. 41. 3. 3ly. For the manner of this *Approbation* of ſuch *major part*; It is thought ſufficient, if it be a *tacit*, and *interpretative*, Approbation only (and not poſitive, or expreſs; for who can ſhew this, to moſt allowed Councils?) Namely, when, ſuch Decrees being promulgated, they ſignifie no oppoſition thereto. Of which thus *Franciſcus à Sanctâ Clarâ* (Syſtem. fidei. *c.* 23. *p.* 262) -- *Neq; tamen dubitandum eſt, quin ſtatim obligare incipiant actus Conciliares, ſi non appareat Eccleſiarum* (*non dico hujus, vel illius, vel aliquorum protervorum hominum*) *reclamatio; nam præſumendum eſt, omnes conſenſiſſe, ſi non conſtet oppoſitum: ut etiam acutè obſervavit* Mirandula, *ubi poſt alia dicit --- Quoad dum univerſalis Eccleſia non reclamarit, neceſſariò credendum eſt.* And thus Dr. *Hammond*, of *Hereſ.* §. 6. n. 15. 16. ---*When a Doctrine is conciliarly agreed on it is then promulgated to all; and the univerſal, though but tacit, approbation, and reception thereof, the no conſiderable contradiction given to it in the Church, is a competent evidence, that this is the Judgment, and concordant Tradition of the whole Church, though no reſolution of Provincial Synods* [which was uſed before ſome General Councils] *hath preceded.--But if their Acts are contradicted, and proteſted againſt, this evidently prejudiceth the Authority of that Council.* And Archbiſhop *Lawd*, §. 26. p. 195. ſaith, --- *It is a ſufficient confirmation to a General Council--if, after it is ended, the whole Church admit it, though never ſo tacitly. The whole Church admit it*, ſaith he. And, *the whole*, ſay we, or, ſuch a major part of the whole, as ought to conclude the reſt. Which admiſſion alſo is ſufficiently diſcerned in the moſt general Conformity, to ſuch Decrees,

Decrees, in men's profeſſion, and practice. For it is all reaſon, that where we cannot have, *Quod creditum eſt ubique; ab omnibus; ſemper*; by reaſon of ſome diviſions in the Church, we hold to what is neareſt it, *quod creditum eſt in pluribus locis; & à pluribus; & diutiùs* or *antiquiùs*; For, the *plures, pluribus locis*, joined in one Communion with the Eccleſiaſtical Head of the Church here on earth, are the ſecureſt Expoſitors to us, of *quod antiquius*; or, *quod creditum ſemper*. See *Diſc.* 3. §. 11.

4ly. For the applying of this Acceptation to all the Decrees of a Council, or only to ſome, whilſt ſome other Decrees are diſclaimed (as ſometimes happens): Here alſo, ſo far as a due Acceptation is extended, ſo far is our Obligation; nor can any reaſonably argue, that, if ſome Acts of a Council are, by ſome after-oppoſition, rendred invalid, therefore no other things paſſed in that Council, and generally approved, have force. §. 42. 4.

5ly. What is ſaid here of the *non-approbation* of ſome Prelates, or Churches (as frequently happens) its not invalidating a Council, or its Decrees, muſt be ſaid alſo of the *abſence* of ſome Prelates from the Council, or of their non-concurrence, when ſitting in it; their *abſence*, 1. Either voluntary; as, of thoſe, who, heterodox in opinion, and fewer in number, foreſee, that probably they ſhall be over-voted by the reſt: (as the *Arian* Prelates did abſent themſelves from the Council of *Sardica*; and ſo, might alſo have abſented themſelves from that of *Nice*; or again, the *Eutychian* Prelats, from *Chalcedon*) notwithſtanding whoſe abſence, or non-concurrence, the Council will not ceaſe to bear the juſt title of *General* (provided, that it conſiſt of a *major part* of the Chriſtian Churches, and have the concurrence of the *Prime Patriarch*; without whom *nihil ſiniendum*): Otherwiſe an Heretical, or Schiſmatical, Church can ſecure themſelves, as they pleaſe, from being condemned by any *General* Council; which, as long as they are abſent, will be called not *General*, and ſo its force cannot extend to them. Nay; otherwiſe, after any defection from the Orthodox Faith, or after any conſiderable Schiſme in the Church, now, there can never be any more *Oecumenical* Councils; becauſe, forſooth, that party fallen away will give no meeting to the other, too prevalent; and thus *General* Councils ceaſe to have any being, when there firſt begins to be any need of them. Of this thus a Learned *Proteſtant* ‖ with intention to make the 5th. Council a *General* one without the preſence of the *Pope*, and his *Occidental* Biſhops. --- *The Preſidence, and Preſence* (ſaith he) *of the Biſhop of* Rome *is not ſo neceſſary in* General *Councils; but that, in caſe of his wilful refuſal, a Council may proceed, and be holden for lawful, without his conſenting to it.* And, --*As a Council may be holden in ſuch a caſe* [i. e. they refuſing to come], *without the preſence, and concurrence of the* Roman *Biſhop, and thoſe that are ſubject to him; ſo, being preſent, if he refuſe to concur in judgment with the reſt, they may proceed without him, and their ſentence may be of force, though he conſent not to it.* What, then, they preſume to affirm, thus, of the *Roman*, they muſt not deny, of their *own* Biſhops. This, that the voluntary abſence of ſome Prelates doth not invalidate a Council, or its Acts. §. 43. 5. ‖ Dr. *Field*, p. 651.

2. Neither yet doth the abſence forced of ſome others; if ſuch, as who being formerly juſtly excommunicated, or anathematized, have now no right to any voting in ſuch Councils, though perhaps, if admitted, theſe might equal the Orthodox in number. Thus *Gelaſius* Biſhop of *Rome*† concerning the *Eutychians*, (when very numerous in the *Eaſt*) and alſo of the Favourers of them, not to be admitted to a Council -- *Eccleſiaſtici moris non eſt, cum his, qui pollutam habent communionem, permixtamq; cum perfidis, miſcere Concilium.*---And, *Meritò ab Apoſtolicâ ſede, caterisq; Catholicis, non jam conſulendi erant, ſed potiùs notandi*, &c.

† Epiſt. *ad Epiſcopos Dardaniæ.*

§. 44. 6.

6ly. What hath been here ſaid of the neceſſary *Conſtitution*, or *Compoſition* of a *General* Council, and *Ratification* of its Acts, muſt be ſaid exactly, on the ſame grounds, concerning a *Patriarchal* or other inferior Council; that it is not neceſſary, that all the Biſhops of ſuch Patriarchy, be aſſembled; or, abſent, do accept, and ratifie it, to make it *Legal*, or *Obligatory*.

§ 45.

2. This ſaid concerning the neceſſary *Compoſition* of a *General* Council; come we next to the *Preſidency*, and *Moderatorſhip* therein.

‖ §. 9, &c † §. 16.

1. Where, 1ſt. As it hath been already ſhewed, in all the other Synods, ‖ *Proteſtants* conſenting† that the Preſidentſhip in them, without any new election made by the Council, or yet by the ſecular power, belongs to him, who hath the prime place, and dignity; the preſiding in the *Provincial* Council, to the *Metropolitan*: in the *National* Council, where be many *Metropolitans*, to the *Primate* of them, &c, which Preſident, alſo, had in theſe Councils a negative voice†: ſo it ſeems all reaſon, that, in a *General* Council alſo, that Prelate ſhould preſide, who is the Biſhop of the *chief See*; and, to whom, in all ages, all other Churches, and Prelates, have allowed the *Primacy*; *i. e.* the Biſhop of *Rome* (See 2. Gen. Counc. *c.* 5). All reaſon, I ſay, That the *Primate* of the *Patriarchs* Preſide in a *General* Council, as the *Primate* of the *Metropolitans*, in a *National*. And, that, what other Priviledges theſe other *Preſidents* enjoyed in thoſe Councils, the ſame at leaſt (though we ſet aſide here his Univerſal Paſtorſhip) He ſhould enjoy in This; agreeable to that ancient Canon, and Cuſtom, in the Univerſal Church, (mentioned by *Socrates*, l. 2. c. 13. ——And *Sozomen*, l. 3. c. 9. --And, vindicated, by *Pope Innocent*, *apud* Auguſt. *Epiſt.* 91.---And, yet more anciently, by *Pope Julius*, againſt ſome Oriental Biſhops, *apud Athanaſ.* Apol. 2.) -- *Sine Romano Pontifice nihil finiendum.*

† See. before §. 10.

§. 46.

2ly. If, in this Matter, *Preſcription* may be of any force; *de facto*, the *Prime Patriarch*, the Biſhop of *Rome*, in the ancient Councils *General* hath always been allowed this *Preſidentſhip*. As will appear to any reviewing the Church-Hiſtory for the firſt 8. *General* Councils: In four of which Councils, namely, the 4*th*. 6*th*. 7*th*. and 8*th*. the *Proteſtants* grant it without diſpute. Next; For his *Preſidency* in the 3d. *General* Council, it ſeems evident enough, from the teſtimony of *Evagrius* ‖, that *Cyril* Biſhop of *Alexandria* was deputed by him to execute this Office; who ſaith, *That the Biſhops meeting in that Council* --- Cyrillo *locum* Cæleſtini, *Epiſcopatum antiquæ* Romæ *gerentis, obtinente,*

‖ *l.* 1. *c.* 4 & *Conc. Eph.* pars 2. Act. 1.

mente, accerſunt Neſtorium, *&c.* whoſe Deputy alſo *Cyril* was made before, for the excommunication of *Neſtorius* by the Authority of the *Apoſtolical See*; as appears in the *Pope's* Letter to *Cyril* † -- *Noſtrâ vice, & loco, cum poteſtate, uſus, ejuſmodi ſententiam exequêris, &c.* † A&. Concil. Eph. *Tom.* 1.

For the 2d. and 5th. *General* Council, both held at *Conſtantinople*; as it is true, that the *Pope* preſided not in them, becauſe indeed neither He, nor his *Legates* were preſent in them; ſo it is true, that theſe Councils were not *General*, till they were, after their *Seſſion*, accepted by him, and the other *Weſtern* Churches. But yet both theſe Councils, apparently enough, yield the Preſidency to him in *General* Councils: the 5th. (which much courted his preſence) in expreſs terms, in *Eutychius* the *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople* his Letter to him ‖ -- *Petimus, præſidente nobis veſtrâ Beatitudine, communi tractatu, eadem capitula in medio proponenda quari*, &c. And the 2d. in that which infers his *preſidency*, whilſt the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, who in the abſence of him, and his *Legates*, preſided in it, challengeth *Primatus honorem* only *poſt Romanum Epiſcopum*. † -- And that Council, in their Epiſtle to *Damaſus* the *Roman* Biſhop, acknowledge their meeting in that Council by order of his Letters. -- *Concurreramus* Conſtantinopolim *ad veſtræ Reverentiæ literas.* Now for the *firſt* Council, That of *Nice*, which only remains: Here alſo the *Pope's* Legates are found to ſubſcribe the firſt, before all the other *Patriarchs*: only *Hoſius* bearing no title, ſave Biſhop of *Corduba*, gives his Vote, and atteſts the *Nicene* Creed, before theſe Legates; which hath cauſed much diſpute, *Gelazius Cyzicenus* ‖ and ſome other Ancients, ſay, *Hoſius* preſided in it, as *Sylveſtri Epiſcopi Maximæ Romæ locum obtinens.* (And indeed, the *Pope's* Primacy before the other *Patriarchs*, and ſo, much more, before a Biſhop of his own Patriarchy, being granted; and no mention being made of any ſuch *Preſidentſhip* conferred on *Hoſius*, either by election of the *Council*, or of the *Emperor*, what can be ſaid, but that he held ſuch *Preſidency* only in this capacity, *viz.* the *Pope's* Deputation (as *Cyril* alſo did in the 3d. *General* Council)?) unleſs any will ſay, that his voting in the firſt place, was a pure Indulgence of honour to him, as being, a Confeſſor in *Dioclefian's* days, and narrowly miſſing Martyrdom; * the *Emperor's* eſpecial Favourite, ſent by him formerly to compoſe the differences in *Egypt* ‖; * a perſon, as *Athanaſius* ſaith of him, † *Obtantos labores omni Reverentiâ dignus* ‖: and now, * the Compiler of the new Form of the *Nicene* Creed. To which *Creed* therefore himſelf gives the firſt teſtimony in this form --- *Hoſius Epiſcopus Civitatis Cordubenſis, Provinciæ* Hiſpaniæ *dixit*; *Ita credo, ſicut ſuperiùs ſcriptum eſt*, after which conſent of his, follows in the firſt place, the *Pope's* Legates *Subſcripſimus*; and then that of the other *Patriarchs*, and *Biſhops*. Where it may alſo be conſidered, what Dr. *Field* hath obſerved ‖ *That the Subſcriptions, in the firſt Councils, were more irregular; and no ſuch certain, and uniform courſe kept in giving preeminences to the chief Biſhops, as was afterward*; For, in this Council, the third *Patriarch* of *Antioch* ſubſcribes not only after the Biſhops of *Egypt*, but of *Paleſtine*, and ſeveral others ſubject to his own Patriarchate. And thus far the ſame Dr. *Field* proceeds in deferring this *Preſidentſhip* to the Biſhop of *Rome*; *All Antiquity* (ſaith he †) *yielded to the Biſhop of* Rome *a Preſidentſhip of honour to have preeminence in place,*

‖ Conc. Conſtant. *Collat.* 1.

† Conc. Conſtant. c. 5.

‖ A&. Conc. *Nic.* l. 2, c. 5.

‖ *Euſeb. de vita* Conſt. *l.* 2, *c.* 62. Socrat, *l.* 1 *c.* 4. † *Apolog.* 2. *Epiſt. ad Solit. vitam agentes.*

‖ p. 652.

† p. 653.

to propose things to be debated, to direct the Actions, and to give definitive Sentence according to the Voices and Judgment of the Council. [He might have added: And, in matters concerning Faith, to render the Act of it invalid, and unconclusive to the Church, without his consent, according to the ancient Canon; *Sine Romano Pontifice nihil finiendum*, &c. as appears in his nulling the Act of the second *Ephesine* Council voting *Eutychianisme*]: *but not a Presidentship of power, to have the power not only of directing, but of ruling their doings also that are assembled in Council, and to conclude of matters after his own judgment, though the greater part of the Council like it not, yea though no part like it.* [But such a *Presidentship* of power in the *Pope*, as to conclude matters after his own judgment, either against the whole, or major part of a *General* Council, is denied as well by modern *Catholicks*, as by *Protestants*, or *Antiquity*.]

§. 47. 1. 3ly. What of *Presiding* in, the same is to be said of the *Calling of*, *General* Councils. 1. Where, 1st, It seems all reason; that, such Meetings being Consultations for the better managing of affairs purely Ecclesiastical, and for the better setling and preserving of the Church's Unity, and Peace, (of the necessity of which meetings the *Clergy* can best judge), All reason, I say, it seems, that the *Calling* of them should belong to the *Clergy*; especially, when the secular powers are not Christian. And this also we find in the Church's practice; that both that first Council, *Act.* 15. and all those following, till *Constantine's* days, were assembled by the *Church's sole* Authority, without the *Prince's* concurrence, or leave; and, if amongst these Councils, none save the first, were absolutely *General*, yet this was not from a defect of power in the Church to convene such a Council, but that she thought, in such a secular opposition, her affairs might be, by many divided Councils *Provincial*, more privately, and securely dispatched, as the Controversy about *Easter* was in the second Century.

This *Right* therefore, formerly possessed by the *Church*, *Princes*, by their submitting unto it, and becoming Christian, cannot justly take away: nor may be thought to do so, by their accumulative power in assisting the Church from time to time for procuring the more effectual concurrence (which much depends on their temporal penalties) of such great Assemblies. But, whatever priviledge of *calling General* Councils should be allowed to *Princes*, so long as *Catholick*, yet at least that Right, which in this matter is conceded to belong to the Church, in case the *Emperor*, or *Prince*, be Infidel, must also be resumed, in case the *Prince Christian* be an enemy to the Orthodox Faith: (*i. e.*) be either Heretical, or Schismatical: (of which likewise it belongs to the Supreme Governors of the Church to judge). For, What mischief may the Church suffer from *unbelieving*, that she may not also suffer from *Heretical*, Princes? And again, must also be resumed, in case the secular Princes, through whose Dominions the *Catholick Church* is dispersed, be many; of many several temporal Interests; and, in respect of these, not facile to concur in the calling such Council, where the Church apprehends need.

§. 48. 2. 2. Next; This hath been shewed already, §. 9. --- & 16. n. 4. in all the inferior Synods, *Protestants* consenting, 1. That the Right of calling them, though

though the Prince be *Christian*, belongs to such an Ecclesiastical person, as hath either a superiority of *Power* over the Members of such Synod, (as, in a *Provincial* Synod, the *Metropolitan* hath); or at least, the superiority of *Order*, and *Place*, (as in a *National* Synod, the *Primate* hath, in respect of the other *Metropolitans*, whereof it consists): ². And belongs to such Ecclesiastical persons, without their first consulting any other preparatory Synod, about calling such Synods: ³. And again, belongs to some of them (as the calling of *Patriarchal* Synods, to the *Patriarch*) when the Bishops, so called together by him, do live under many several secular Governments; Yet ---- *which Patriarchs* (saith Dr. *Field* ‖) *are neither so depending of, nor subject to, the power of Princes, but that when they are enemies to the Faith* [I add Faith, either Christian, or Catholick] *they may exercise the same without their consent, and privity, and subject them, that refuse to obey their Summons, to such punishments, as the Canons of the Church do prescribe in cases of such contempt, or wilful negligence.* And the 8th. *General* Council, (*Can.* 17.) upon occasion of some Metropolitans, *qui, ne secundum vocationem Apostolici Præsulis occurrant, à mundi Principibus se detineri, sine ratione, causantur*, declares also thus against such Princes ---- *Cùm Princeps pro suis causis conventum frequenter agat, impium esse, ut summos Præsules ad Synodos pro Ecclesiasticis negotiis celebrandum impediant, vel quosdam ab eorum Conciliis prohibeant*: And all these things are justified, and allowed by *Protestants*: Suitably then to all the rest it seems all reason, That the calling of a *General Council*, *i. e.* a Synod consisting of many *Patriarchs*, and their Patriarchies, should belong to the *Primate* of the *Patriarchs*, or Bishop of the *chief See*; though we suppose, that he claim no more, than a preeminency of order, as *Primates* do over *Metropolitans*. ‖ p. 668.

Of this matter therefore some Learned *Protestants* seem to speak more moderately. §. 49.

1st. Thus Mr. *Thorndike* concerning the Right of *Calling Councils* its belonging to the Church. *Epil.* p. 53. ---*I must* (saith he) *here not omit to alledge the Authority of Councils; and to maintain, the Right, and Power of holding them, and the obligation, which the Decrees of them, regularly made, is able to create, to stand by the same authority of the Apostles*: He accounting that Assembly (*Act.* 1.) at the election of *Matthias*, a *General Council*; and again, that, *Act.* 15.

And then, thus Bp. *Bramhal*, concerning the *Prime Patriarch's* calling such Council, *Schism-guarded*, p. 356. ---- *If the Pope*, (saith he) *hath any right, either to convocate General Councils himself, or to represent to Christian Soveraigns the fit Seasons for convocation of them, either in respect of his beginning of Unity, or of his Protopatriarchate, we do not envy it him, since there may be a good use of it in respect of the division of the Empire, so good caution be observed.* Bellarmine † *confesseth that power which we acknowledge; that is, that, though the Pope be no Ecclesiastical Monarch, but only Chief of the principal Patriarchs, yet the Right to convocate General Councils should pertain unto him.* So B. *Bramhal*. † *De Concil.* l. 1. c. 12.

Dr. *Field* speaks yet more distinctly, and copiously; ‖ ---- *The State of the Christian Church* (saith he) *being spiritual, is such, that it may stand, though not only forsaken, but grievously oppressed, by the great men of the world: and therefore it is by all resolved on; that the Church hath her Guides and Rulers distinct* ‖ *Of the Church.* p. 67.

from

from them that bear the Sword: and that there is, in the Church, a power of convocating these her spiritual Pastors, to consult of things concerning her welfare, though none of the Princes of the world do favour her. ---- *And there is no question, but that this power* [of convocating these Pastors] *is in them that are first, and before other, in each company of spiritual Pastors, and Ministers.* ---- *Hereupon we shall find, that the calling of Diocesan Synods pertaineth to the Bishop; of Provincial, to the Metropolitan; of National, to the Primate; and of Patriarchal, to the Patriarch.* And of these he saith ---- *That they neither are so depending*, &c, quoted before, §. 48. Lastly, Concerning the Calling of *General* Councils ---- *In times of persecution* (saith he) *and when there are no Christian Princes* [*i. e.* to assist the Church, as he saith afterward] --- *If there be any matter of Faith, or any thing concerning the whole State of the Christian Church, wherein a common deliberation of all the Pastors of the Church is necessary, he that is in order the first among the Patriarchs, with the Synods of Bishops subject to him, may call the rest together, as being the principal part of the Church, whence all actions of this nature do take beginning.* Instancing in *Julius*, and *Damasus*, Bishops of *Rome*, with their Councils, practising this. So Dr. *Field*.

§. 50. Only, here you see two limitations, or bars, put in by him, for the Reformation to make some advantage of. The one; *In times of persecution*, or, *when the Church hath not Princes to assist her*, then, the power of *Calling General Councils* to belong to the *Clergy*. The other; That then it belongs, in the Clergy, to the *Prime Patriarch*; yet not singly; but, *joined with his Council*, ‖ p. 668. for (saith he ‖) *the first Patriarch hath not power, singly, to call together the other Patriarchs, and their Bishops, because none of them is superior to another in degree, as Bishops are to Presbyters, nor so, in Order, Honour, and Place, as Metropolitans are to Bishops; or Patriarchs, to Metropolitans.* Now, to the first of these, his limiting this Ecclesiastical power only to times of persecution, † §. 47. see what hath been said already †; and his own instances prove against it; for *Julius*, and *Damasus*, summoned the *Oriental* Bishops to such a Council, the one of them in the Reign of *Constans*, the other, of *Theodosius*, both of these being Christian, Orthodox, Catholick, *Emperors*. Though, if this be allowed, that in any non-assistance of the secular powers (Heathen, or Christan, it matters not) the Church hath power, when she judgeth it requisite, to assemble such Councils, more needs not be desired. Concerning his second Limitation; In the reason he gives for it, he omits one Superiority among the rest, which would have fitted the purpose; namely, the Superiority, that *Primates* have to the other *Metropolitans*, in their calling a *National* Synod, and that without any Assembly of the *Primate's* own Bishops, first consulted: I ask therefore, why not the *Primate* of the *Patriarchs*, do the like? 2ly. If the first *Patriarch* singly have no authority for calling together the other *Patriarchs*, neither hath he, *joined* with his *Synod*; his Synod having no more power over other *Patriarchs*, than himself. As for the Instances: *Julius* sent to the *Orientals*, singly, concerning a Council, to be joined of both the *East* and *West*. *Damasus* indeed sent, when a *Western* Council was sitting; but this called for other matters, and not for this, to give him a Commission for such

a

a Summons, or to join with him in it; as if the first *Patriarch* cannot, when need requires, call a *General* Council without first Summoning, and convening a *Patriarchal* Council, to give their consent to the calling of this *General*: A thing, to which the Church's practice is known to be contrary; and also the convening of a *Patriarchal* Council, a matter of so great trouble, and delay, as it seems most unreasonable to require the assembling of such a Council, either for this, or for much other Church-business (as, hearing Appeals of less account &c.) which come to the *Patriarch's* hands. And the same Dr. *Field* elsewhere grants so much; where he saith ‖, ---- *That in time, causes growing many, and the difficulties intollerable, in coming together, and in staying to hear these Causes thus multiplied, and increased* [which he confesseth before, to be just considerations] *it was thought fitter to refer the hearing of Complaints, and Appeals, to Metropolitans, and such like Ecclesiastical Judges, limited, and directed by Canons, and Imperial Laws, than to trouble the Pastors of whole Provinces, and to wrong the people by the absence of their Pastors, and Guides.* Thus Dr. *Field.* ---- *And the* Protestant-Primates (saith Bishop *Bramhal* †) *use the same customs of judging Church-Causes, without calling Synods.* Now what is, in this kind, conceded to *Metropolitans*, much more ought to be to *Patriarchs*; whose Councils are not so easily collected as *Provincial*; nor ever was a set time appointed for these, as for the other. This said, concerning the Calling of *General* Councils, its belonging, of right, to the Church; and, in it, to the Supremest Prelate.

‖ p. 513.

† *Vind.* c. 13. p. 257.

3ly. It is not denied, but that the *Emperor* had, and, since the dissolution of the Empire, other *Princes* joined, still have a lawful power of convocating a *General* Assembly of the same Prelates, as being their Subjects; *of calling these*, both in assistance to the Church in her necessities; and also in order to their own Civil affairs, when any way disturbed by contentions in the Church; Provided, this be with the *Prime Patriarch's* consent; *consent*, either before, or, at least after, the Indiction of them. Of which thus *Bellarmine*: ‖ -- *Catholici munus convocandi Concilia Generalia ad Romanum Pontificem propriè pertinere volunt; sic tamen, ut possit etiam alius, Pontifice consentiente, Concilium indicere; quinetiam satis sit, si indictionem factam ipse postea ratam habeat, & confirmet, at si, nec ipse indicat Concilium, nec aliquis alius de ejus mandato vel consensu, nec ipse saltem approbat indictionem, illud non Concilium, sed Conciliabulum fore.*

§. 51. 3.

‖ *De Concil.* l. 1. c. 12.

And this thing is made good by the ancient practice; where, As the *Emperors*, being, by their secular power, much more effectual promoters thereof, were prevailed with to call the *first General Councils*, so this was not done, but either from the first Motion, or with the consent, of the Bishop of *Rome*, the Supreme Head of the Church; as appears concerning all the first 6. *General Councils*, in the acclamatory speech of the 6th. Council, at the conclusion thereof, to the *Emperor* --- *Arius Divisor*, &c. They naming [1] *Sylvester*, [2] *Damasus*, [3] *Cœlestinus*, [4] *Leo*, [5] *Vigilius*, [6] *Agatho*, Bishops of *Rome*, joined with the *Emperor*, in the promoting all these Councils. And, to come to some particulars, Concerning the *Second* General Council of *Constantinople*; thus saith that Council in their Letter to *Damasus*, and to the Coun-

§. 52.

cil

cil assembled with him at *Rome*. --- *Concurreramus* Constantinopolim, *ad vestra Reverentia* [*i. e.* of *Damasus* singly, this Council not then sitting, when the *Orientals* met first in Council, though it did, when they writ,] *literas, missas* Theodosio, *summâ pietate Imperatori*. Concerning the 3d. Council thus *Prosper* (*in Chronico*) --- *Synodum Ephesinam factam esse* Cyrilli *industriâ, & Cœlestini authoritate*. Concerning the 4th. Thus the *Emperor* to *Leo*, (in the Epistles pertaining to that Council) ---*Supereſt, ut si placuerit tua Beatitudini in has partes advenire*, &c, *Synodum celebrare, hoc facere Religionis affectu dignetur, nostris utique desideriis vestra Sanctitas satisfaciet, & Sacra Religioni, quæ utilia sunt decernet. Si verò hoc onerosum est, ut tu ad has partes advenias, hoc ipsum nobis propriis Literis tua Sanctitas manifestet, quatenus in omnem Orientem, & in ipsam* Thraciam & Illyricum *sacræ nostræ literæ dirigantur, ut ad quendam definitum locum, ubi nobis placuerit, omnes sanctissimi Episcopi debeant convenire; & qua Christianorum Religioni, atque Catholicæ Fidei, prosint, sicut Sanctitas tua secundùm Ecclesiasticas Regulas definiverit, suâ dispositione declarent.* To which add, * that of *Pulcheria* the *Emperor's* Sister, to the same *Pope*. ---- *Propterea tua Reverentia, quocunque modo prospexerit, significare dignetur, ut omnes etiam totius Orientis Episcopi*, Thraciæ *atque* Illyrici (*sicut etiam nostro Domino piissimo Imperatori placuit*) *in unam Civitatem velociter ab Orientalibus partibus valeant convenire; & illic facto Concilio, de Catholicâ confessione*, &c, *te authore, decernant.* And, * the Accusation of *Dioscorus* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, in the first Act of that Council --- *Quòd Synodum ausus est facere sine authoritate Sedis Apostolicæ, quod nunquam factum est, nec fieri licuit*; The like to which see in the Epistle of Pope *Pelagius* 2. to the *Oriental* Bishops, against *John* Bishop of *Constantinople*: And that of *Gelasius*, who lived about some 40. years after, in his Epistle *ad Episcopos Dardaniæ*. -- *Sedes Apostolica impiam Synodum* [*i. e.* the second *Ephesine*] *non consentiendo, sola summovit; & authoritate, ut Synodus Chalcedonensis fieret, sola decrevit.* Lastly, If the ancient Canon, that in such Councils *Sine Romano Pontifice nihil finiendum*, stand good, the *calling* such Councils by *Emperors*, without the Mandate, or consent also of this *Bishop*, will be to no purpose; because nothing can be established therein, without his concurrence. Thus much of the power of *Calling* General *Councils*.

CHAP. IV.

I. Head.

Of the Generality, and just Authority, of the Council of Trent.

1. *That the* Western *Churches, and particularly, that of* England, *are not freed from subjection to this Council, though it were not* General; *if,* Patriarchal. §. 53.

2. *Or,*

2. *Or, if only ſo* General, *as thoſe times were capable of.* §. 65.

3. *That it is not hindred from being* General, *by reaſon of the abſence of the* Greek *Churches.* §. 66.

4. *Nor by reaſon of the abſence of the* Proteſtant *Clergy.* §. 67.

THeſe things touching Church-Government (from §. 9.) being premiſed in general, (a cloſer application of which ſhall be made to this famous Council of *Trent*, as occaſion requires,) I proceed to a more particular conſideration of the firſt Head propoſed before ‖, concerning the *Generality*, and *juſt Authority*, of this Council, to oblige all the Church's Subjects; eſpecially, thoſe of the *Weſt*. §. 53. ‖ §. 8.

1. Where, in the firſt place, it is to be noted: That, ſuppoſing this Council of *Trent*, no legal, and free, *General*, yet if it be a free, and legal, *Patriarchal*, Council, thus it will ſtand obligatory (at leaſt for the obedience of non-contradiction) to the *Reformed*; and particularly, to the *Engliſh* Church. 1.

For 1ſt. It hath been formerly cleared, both by the *Church Canons* ‖, and the *Conceſſions* of *Proteſtants* †; That, as a *Dioceſan* Synod is ſubject to that compoſed of many Dioceſſes, or to a *Provincial*, where the *Metropolitan* preſides; and again a *Provincial*, or *Metropolitan*, Synod, to a *National*, or that compoſed of many Provinces, wherein the *Primate* of the Metropolitans preſides; ſo again is this *National* Synod (the Catholick Church, in many Nations, being but *One*) ſubject to that compoſed of ſeveral Nations, and their *Primates*, called, and preſided-in, by one of the principal *Patriarchs*. Neither, whatever Superiority ſuch *Patriarch*, *really*, hath, needeth he, for the ſubjection of ſuch *Primates*, and their reſpective Churches, to this *Patriarchal* Council, any other power over theſe *Primates*, ſave what theſe *Primates* are granted to have over the *Metropolitans*; whoſe *Provincial* Synods, we ſee, are ſubjected to a *National*, or the *Primate's* Synod. Neither, if it could be proved, that the chief *Patriarchs* have over *National Primates*, no ſuperiority of power; or at leaſt, that ſome particular *Provinces*, as to *Ordinations*, or ſome other Juriſdictions, are utterly exempt from *Patriarchal* authority, may therefore ſuch *Provinces* pretend freedom from any obedience to the Decrees of a Council *Patriarchal*, wherein ſome one of theſe *Patriarchs* preſides; no more, than they can juſtly pretend freedom from a Council *Oecumenical* on the ſame account; in which Council *Oecumenical*, or *General*, though the ſame *Primates* ſhould acknowledge no Eccleſiaſtical *Perſon* their Superior, yet could they not deny the *Council* to be ſo. Subject, then, are *National* Synods, and Churches, to *Patriarchal*; *and* to this end *every Church* (as Dr. *Field* obſerves, *p.* 513. cited before. §. 16. n. 5.) *is ſubordinate to ſome one of the Patriarchal Churches, and incorporated into the Unity of it.* Of the neceſſity of which Union of Churches in *Patriarchal* Synods, in the ſo much more difficult, and chargeable, aſſembling of ſuch, as are abſolutely *Univerſal*, ſee before, §. 16. n. 4.

‖ See, before, §. 11, 12, &c. † §. 16. n. 4. &c.

§. 54.

2. Next; The *Church of* England; one of those the most anciently professing Christianity, which it is clear it did, before *Tertullian's* time ‖, never pretended subjection to any other *Patriarch*, or his Council, than this of the *West*; to whom also it ascribes its *Conversion*, without dispute, as for the *Saxons*, or *English*; if not also, as for the *Britains*. And accordingly, both in ancient, and latter times, (if the *mos antiquus obtineat*, in the 6th. Canon of *Nice*, be of any force) it hath always ranged it self, and appeared, in the *Western* Councils, as a *Member* of this Patriarchy, and of the *Latine* Church; and, from time to time, concurred in the passing of those *Canons*, which have established the Authority of the *Roman* Patriarch, and of these *Patriarchal* Councils.

‖ See *Tertullian Apol. & adversus* Judæos, c. 7. - *Orig.* in Ezech. Hom. 4. — *Bede Hist.* Angl. l. 1. c. 4.

§. 55.

After several Christians suffering Martyrdom here, in *Diocletian's* time; In the *Council* at *Arles* in *France*, 10. years before that of *Nice*, assembled by *Constantine*, (who, being born in *England*, and his Mother an *English* Woman, and a *Christian*, and, being after his Father's death, here also first declared *Emperor* by his Army, may be presumed to have had some particular respects for the *Brittish Clergy*,) we find the presence, and subscription of several *Brittish* Bishops acknowledged by Dr. *Hammond* ‖, and B. *Bramhal* †, and of which thus Sir *Henry Spelman*. *A. D.* 314. —— *Aderant è Britanniâ celebriores (ut videtur) tres Episcopi* [Surely, in dignity much preceding, and much ancienter than the Bishop of *Caerleon*], *nempe Eboracensis, Londinensis, & de Civitate Colonia Lodunensium (quæ aliàs dicitur Camelodunum) unà cum Sacerdote, Presbytero, & Diacono, qui & Canones assensu suo approbabant, &, in Britanniam redeuntes, secum deferebant observandos.* The first Canon whereof setleth the matter of *Easter* to be kept, through all the Churches, on the same day; and the divulgation of this through all Churches, was committed to the *Bishop* of *Rome*, the *Western*, and *Prime Patriarch*, *secundùm consuetudinem*, saith the Canon. Again, at the Council held at *Ariminum*, and before this, in that of *Sardica*, assembled, *A. D.* 347. some 20. years after that of *Nice*, is found the presence of the *Britain*, among other *Western*, Bishops, witnessed by *Athanasius*, who was present there himself, in his second *Apology*: And, therefore, may the Canons of that Council be presumed, among the rest, to be ratified by them; or, at least, being passed by the major part of that *Occidental* Council, to oblige them. Now, what honour these Canons give to the *Roman Bishop*, how they allow and ratifie his supreme Decision of *Appeals*, &c, Protestants are not ignorant; and therefore, to evade it, make such exceptions as these: ‖ ---[1]. *That it doth not appear, that the Brittish Bishops did assent to that Canon.* But this matters not, the major part, in Councils, concluding the rest; and neither doth it appear on the other side, but that they did approve it; which also is to be presumed, where appears no contradiction. [2]. Again urged; *That it was no General Council.* But it sufficeth for the *Britains*, if it were, at least, a compleat *Occidental* Council. [3]. Pleaded; *That these* Canons *of* Sardica *were never incorporated into the* English *Laws, and therefore did not bind* English *Subjects.* But *Church-Canons*, and *Decrees*, in matters Ecclesiastical, do oblige all the Members of the Church, though *Princes* oppose; Oblige *Princes* also, if Christian, and so the Church's Subjects.

‖ Schism p. 110.
† *Vindic. of the Church of* England, p. 98.
‖ B. *Bramhal*, Reply to S. W. P. 243.

And

And the Author that requireth this incorporation of Church-Canons into the Prince's Laws, explains himſelf elſewhere ‖, to mean only, that Church-Decrees oblige not, as to the uſing any *coactive* power in his Realms for the execution of them, without the Prince's leave, *becauſe* (ſaith he) *ſuch external coactive Juriſdiction is originally Political*; a thing granted him; ſo that, before ſuch leave, or enrolment, the Church's Decrees oblige both Prince, and People, if Chriſtian, *in foro Conſcientiæ*, the diſobedient juſtly incurring the Church's cenſures; the thing we, here, contend for. Laſtly, *The* 9th. *Canon of* Chalcedon [a ſubſequent *General* Council] *is pretended to contradict theſe of* Sardica, *in giving the Supremacy in Appeals to the Patriarch of* Conſtantinople. But I need not tell him, that this *Conſtantinopolitan* Supremacy is not for the *Weſt*, but *Eaſt*, which is, for the Controverſies of thoſe Provinces there, ſubject to that *Patriarch*.

‖ Schiſm guarded, p. 160.

§. 56. And from the preſence of the *Britain* Biſhops in theſe ancient Councils (if I may make here a little digreſſion) appears the ignorance of the Abbot of *Bangor* (if the Relation be true) in being ſuch a ſtranger to the *Pope's* Perſon, Authority, or Titles, after *A. D.* 600. after all that power exerciſed by him, for ſo many Ages, in the *Weſtern* Provinces, conceded by *Proteſtants* (ſee Dr. *Field*, of the *Church*, *l.* 5. from *c.* 32. to *c.* 40.); after ſo many *miſſions*, of ſeveral holy Biſhops from the *Pope* of *Rome*, either to *plant*, and propagate, Chriſtianity in theſe Iſlands of *Britain*, and *Ireland*; or, to *reform* it. —— * Of *Fugatius*, and *Damianus*, very early ſent by Pope *Eleutherius*, in King *Lucius* his days; which King, in the greater nearneſs of ſeveral Chriſtian Biſhops in *France*, yet addreſſed himſelf to the *Pope*, as the common Father of the *Weſtern* Church.—Afterward, * Of S. *Germanus*, about *A. D.* 430. ſent by Pope *Celeſtine* (ſaith *Proſper*, † one who lived alſo in theſe times) accompanied with *Lupus* another *French* Biſhop who alſo conſecrated *Dubritius*, that was the firſt Archbiſhop of *Caer-Leon*. — * Of *Palladius*, and *Ninius*, and *Patricius*, all made Biſhops at *Rome*, and ſent thence to the *Picts*, *Scots*, and *Iriſh*: (Concerning which, ſee the Church-Hiſtory, in *Bede*, *Baronius*, *Spelman*).— And, beſides this, * when the *Iriſh* Biſhops yielded all obedience to this *Roman* Biſhop at this very time that the *Britiſh* are ſaid to deny it; as appears, both for that they are ſaid by *Bede* ‖ (the South-*Iriſh* at leaſt) to have returned very early to a right obſervation of *Eaſter*, * *ad admonitionem Apoſtolicæ Sedis Antiſtitis*: And alſo, for that, about this time, they ſent Letters to S. *Gregory*, then Biſhop of *Rome*, to know, after what manner they ought to receive into the Church ſuch as were converted from *Neſtorianiſme*, to whom he ſends his *Orders* concerning it, directed—*Quirino Epiſcopo, & cæteris Epiſcopis in Hiberniâ Catholicis*, (*l.* 9. Epiſt. 61.)

† *In Chronico.*

‖ *l.* 3. *c.* 3.

§. 57. Hence alſo is diſcovered the unreaſonableneſs of the ſaid *Abbot's* denial of his obedience to the *Pope*; or, pleading ſubjection only to the Archbiſhop of *Caerleon*, excluſive to any other ſuperior whatever. For, waving here the Queſtion; whether the *Pope*, by his ſingle authority, could ſubject the Archbiſhop of *Caerleon*, and his Province, to S. *Auſtin* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, (done afterward in *Henry* the firſt his time, with the approbation of *Proteſtants*; and, therefore, which might have been done in S. *Auguſtin's*): yet *ſubjected*

jected was this *Britain* Clergy to the *Canons* of *Arles*, and *Sardica*, of which Councils their Representatives were Members, and so subjected to the *Western Patriarch* also, for any authority which these Canons declare to be invested in him; and, from the same obligation of obedience, was their Conformity, in the celebration of *Easter*, with the rest of the *Western* Churches, which was required by the first Canon of the Council of *Arles*, in this Abbot's time, most unjustly refused.

§. 58. Mean-while, whatever *Independence* can be shewed to have been challenged, or Unconformity practised, by the Abbot of *Bangor*, and others, within the *Province* of the Archbishop of *Caerleon*; yet there is no reason, that the same should be extended, or applied to the *National* Church of the *Britains* in General. For the first Archbishop of *Caerleon* is *Dubritius*; who, being a Disciple of S. *German*, sent from *Rome*; and being consecrated *Arch-bishop* of this City by him, and *Lupus*, it is probable, was, for his time conformable to the Customs of the *Roman* See; and contrary to those owned in *Austin's* time by these *Britains*: But however; This of *Caerleon* was but an Archbishoprick of a late erection; the 3d. or 4th. from which *Dubritius*, probably must possess that Chair, when *Austin* came: But the *Britains* had, long before *Dubritius* his time, other *Bishops* much preeminent to *Caerleon*: *The *Archbishop* of *York* (the chief Bishop of the whole Nation (as that City then was the principal City, the *Roman Prætorium* being there; see *Spelm.* Appar. *p.* 22.); *a Bishop of *London*, and Bishops of some other places, appearing formerly in several Councils. Of which Bishops, *Todiacus* Archbishop of *York*, and *Theonus* Bishop of *London*, being persecuted by the *Saxons*, fled into *Wales* with their Clergy, *A. D.* 586. within eleven years after whose flight thither, *Augustine* came into *England*; and, upon it, their persecution in part ceased. Now, there being no mention of any *opposition* made, by any of these Bishops, or their Clergy (which, in eleven years space, could not all be deceased) to *Austin*; but only by the *Welsh* under *Caerleon*, what can be imagined here more reasonable, than, *That they conformed to the rest of the *West* in such submission to *its Patriarch*, as was due to him by the Canons of those Councils, which their Predecessors had allowed; and as was rendered to him by their neighbour-Prelacy of *Ireland*, (see *Greg. l.* 9. *Epist.* 61). as likewise, *That they celebrated *Easter* according to those Conciliary *Canons*, and the *Roman* manner; and lastly, *That returning into some of those parts of *Britain* from whence they fled, they assisted *Augustin* in the conversion of the *Saxons*.

§. 59. From the presence, then, of the *Britain* Bishops in these ancient Councils, also appears the insufficiency of that Argument, which would prove the ancient *Britains* former non-subjection to, or conversion by, the *Western* Patriarch, or his Missives, from their having at *Austin's* arrival a different observation of *Easter* from the rest of the *West*.

I. For 1st. It is manifest, that they followed not the practice of their Forefathers herein: *manifest*, both, from the presence of the former *Britain* Bishops in the Council of *Arles*, which Council determined this matter; of whom

A. D. 314. Sir *Henry Spelman* saith, — *Qui & Canones assensu suo approbabant; & in Britanniam*

tanniam redeuntes ſecum deferebant obſervandos. And alſo, from *Conſtantine's* Letter †, to perſwade the *Aſian* Churches to uniformity with the reſt of the world in the obſervation of it; He naming there, among other Churches, particularly this of *Britain*; unleſs any will ſay; that, whilſt the moſt eminent Provinces of *Britain* kept it after the *Roman* manner, yet the *Welſh*, and *Scots*, then kept it otherwiſe. But, ſince S. *German*, and *Lupus*, who came hither two ſeveral times, and from whom *Dubritius*, their firſt Archbiſhop of *Caerleon*, received his education, ſolemnly kept their *Eaſter* here with the *Britain* Clergy (See *Bede*, *l.* 1. *c.* 20.) it follows, either that their obſervation of *Eaſter* was then altogether *Catholick*; or, that, if it was otherwiſe, yet, by reaſon that the difference happeneth not in every year, it was that year by theſe Biſhops not taken notice of.

† *Socrat. Hiſt. l.* 1. *c.* 6.

2ly. It is clear alſo, That as theſe *Britains* varied from the *Roman* Cuſtome in this, ſo did they from the *Eaſter Quartodecimans* of *Aſia*; and therefore, may not, for this, be thought to have derived their Chriſtianity from thence; The *Britains* keeping their *Paſch* conſtantly on the *Lord's* Day; only, when the *Lord's* Day happened on the 14th. day of the Moon, they kept it with the *Jews*, and *Quartodecimans*, contrary to the *Roman* Cuſtom, that obſerved it, in ſuch year, on the *Sunday* following: for which, ſee *Bede*, *l.* 3. *c.* 4. & 25. §. 60. 1 2

3. Laſtly, *Bede* ‖ ſpeaks of this Errour, in the *Scotch* Nation (and the ſame may be preſumed, in the *Britiſh*) *Nuperrimè, temporibus illis, hanc apud eos hæreſin exortam; & non totam eorum gentem, ſed quoſdam ex iis, hâc fuiſſe implicitos.* Which *Honorius*, and other *Roman* Biſhops with their Letters (See *Bede Ib.*) endeavoured (as ſoon as might be) to ſuppreſs. And judge you, by theſe things, how juſtifiable thoſe proceedings of the *Britain Clergy*, or *Councils* of that time, (mentioned by Biſhop *Bramhal*, *Vindic.* p. 104.) were, in oppoſition to *Auſtin* the Monk: who only required of them in this thing to follow the Tradition of the Church; and objected againſt them: -- *Quod in multis, Romanæ conſuetudini, immò Univerſalis Eccleſiæ, contraria gererent; & quòd ſuas Traditiones univerſis, quæ per orbem ſibi invicem concordant, Eccleſiis præferrent.* All which was true; and the Proponent alſo confirmed this truth before them with a Miracle, reſtoring ſight to a blind man. See Sir *Hen. Spelman*, A. D. 601. ‖ *Hiſt. l.* 2. *c.* 19.

Pardon this Digreſſion, made to abate a little the Confidence of thoſe, who would collect ſome extraordinary liberty of the *Britannick* Church from the ſuperintendency of the *Weſtern* Patriarch, from this *Declaration* of the *Abbot* of *Bangor*; and the *different obſervation* of *Eaſter*. Of which matter Mr. *Thorndike*, in maintaining the viſible Unity of the Church Catholick to conſiſt in the reſort of inferior Churches to ſuperiors, (the viſible Heads of which Reſort, he ſaith, were *Rome*, *Alexandria*, and *Antiochia*) ſpeaks thus, more moderately: † --- *They that would except* Britain *out of this Rule*, [of ſubjection] *upon the act of the* Welſh *Biſhop's refuſing* Auſtin *the Monk for their Head, ſhould conſider that S.* Gregory, *ſetting him over the* Saxon *Church, which he had founded, according to Rule, tranſgreſſed the Rule, in ſetting him over the* Welſh *Church.* --*Setting this caſe aſide, the reſt of that little remembrance, that remains concerning the* Britiſh *Church, teſtifies the like reſpect from it to the Church of* Rome: † *Juſt weights, p.* 40.

as appears, from the Churches of Gaul, Spain, *and* Affrick, *of which there is no cause to doubt, that they first received their Christianity from the Church of* Rome.]

§. 61 To proceed; and, from the *Council* of *Arles*, and *Sardica*, and *Ariminum* spoken of before ‖, to come to later times; we find the *English Bishops*
‖ §. 55. either *concurring*, and presenting themselves as members, with the rest, in those Occidental Councils of a later Date; the several *Lateran* Councils, that of *Constance*, *Basil*, and *Florence*; or, in absence, *acquiescing* in, and *conforming* to, the Votes, and Acts thereof; which Acts have confirmed to the Bishop of *Rome* those Jurisdictions over the whole Church; (excepting the question of his Superiority to *General Councils*), or, at least, over the *Western* part thereof, which the present Reformation denies him. For which see the *Council* of *Constance*, (much urged by *Protestants*, as no Flatterer of the *Pope*, and wherein, the Council voting by Nations, the *English* were one of the four,) *Sess.* 8. & 15. condemning, against *Wickleff*, and *Hus*, such Propositions as these, --- *Papa non est immediatus Vicarius Christi, & Apostolorum.* --- *Summus Pontifex Ecclesiæ Romanæ non habet Primatum super alias Ecclesias particulares.* --- Petrus *non fuit, neque est, Caput Ecclesiæ Sanctæ Catholicæ.* --- *Papa Prafectio, & Institutio, à* Cæsaris *potentiâ emanavit.* --- Papa *non est manifestus, & verus Successor, Apostolorum-Principis,* Petri, *si vivit moribus contrariis* Petro. --- *Non est scintilla apparentiæ, quod oportet esse unum Caput in Spiritualibus regens Ecclesiam, quod* [Caput] *semper cum ipsâ militanti Ecclesiâ conservetur, & conservatur.* Now, the contrary Propositions to these, authorized by a Council supposed not *General*, but *Patriarchal* only, are obligatory at least to the members thereof, and consequently to their Posterity, until a Council of equal authority shall reverse them: As in Civil Governments, the same Laws which bind the Parents, bind the Children, without the Legislative power, *de novo*, asking their consent.

Not many years after the Council of *Chalcedon*, in the Patriarchy of *Alexandria*, there succeeded to *Proterius*, a *Catholick* Bishop, *Timotheus* an *Eutychian* (since which time also the Churches of *Egypt*, and *Ethiopia*, remain still *Eutychian*, or at least, *Dioscorists*): And, in the Patriarchy of *Antioch*, to *Martyrius*, a *Catholick* Bishop, succeeded *Petrus Fullo*, an *Eutychian*: And in the Empire, to *Leo*, an Orthodox *Emperor*, succeeded *Zeno*, an *Eutychian*: And all these declared their *non-acceptance* of the *Council* of *Chalcedon*: Yet this did no way unfixe, with posterity, the stability of its Authority, or Decrees. Neither can the modern *Eutychians* justifie their non-submission to that Council hence, because they can produce some persons, and those *Patriarchs* too, that have, in succeeding times, but after a former more general *Acceptation*, opposed it.

§. 62. 3ly. After the *English*, and before them, the *British*, Bishops, thus shewed §. 54. to have been subject to a *Patriarchal Council*; upon what pretence, or new priviledge since the *Reformation*, these Bishops should plead any exemption from submitting to the Decrees thereof when accepted by a
‖ See before, §. 40. much major part of the Church-Prelacy (an acceptation sufficient ‖) I see not.

For

For 1ſt. The *Pope's* calling it no way renders ſuch a Council irregular; for it is granted by *Proteſtants*, that the Calling a *Patriarchal* Council (though not of a *General*) of right belongeth to Him; neither may the Biſhops of ſuch Patriarchy juſtly diſobey his *Summons*; or ſecular *Prince* hinder their journy †. 1. † See before.

2ly. Neither can the abſence of the *Eaſtern* Biſhops, here, be ſtood upon: becauſe their preſence, not neceſſary in ſuch a Council. §. 16. n. 5, 2.

3ly. Nor can the ſecular power, under which ſuch *Proteſtant* Biſhops live (eſpecially, whenas no Heathen, but himſelf alſo a Subject of the Church), oppoſing, or not-accepting ſuch a Council's Decrees, free the Church's Subjects in his Dominions from obſervation thereof; (I mean, if ſuch Decrees be in matters purely Eccleſiaſtical, and ſpiritual, and no way intrenching upon his Civil Rights, of which enough hath been ſaid formerly). 3.

Biſhop *Bramhal's* Plea, that ſuch Decrees oblige not any *Prince's* Subjects, till by him incorporated into his Laws, as if Chriſtians were to obey no Church-Laws, unleſs firſt made the King's, hath been ſpoken to before ‖: Dr. *Hammond's* grand Plea, on which he lays the greateſt weight for ſecuring the *Reformation* (See his Treatiſe of *Schiſm, c.* 6,7. *p.* 115,132,137,138,142.) *viz.* the Prince's power and right to tranſlate Patriarchies; and to remove that of *Rome* to *Canterbury*, helps not; at leaſt in this matter; (nor perhaps did he ever mean it ſhould extend ſo far, as to exempt any *Weſtern* Nation from all ſubjection to a *free Occidental* Council). For 1ſt. He grants; That the Prince can do no ſuch thing, ſo far as it thwarts the Canons of the Church: See *Anſw. to Schiſm Diſarmed*, p. 164. ---- *A Power* (ſaith he) *Princes have to erect Metropoles*, [and hence he collects, new Patriarchs]; *but, if it be exerciſed ſo, as to thwart known Canons, and Cuſtoms of the Church, this certainly is an abuſe.* Which he hath the more reaſon to maintain in this particular, becauſe he is in ſome doubt (as appears in his Anſwer to *S. W.* †) whether Princes do not hold ſuch power of tranſlating, or erecting Patriarchs from the Church's Grant. Now ſurely this will be confeſſed contrary to the Church's Canons for a Prince to make ſuch a removal of the *Patriarch's* former Juriſdiction, as thereby to null, as to his Subjects, the authority of a *Patriarchal* Council. And, if, indeed, the erecting, and removing *Patriarchs* did originally belong to *Princes*, yet, ſince the Civil Governments that are contained within the Precincts of one Patriarchy, are now in the hands of many ſeveral Soveraigns, the repeal of any *Patriarch's* former authority, as it relates to the convening of ſuch Councils, muſt be an act at leaſt of the *Major part* of theſe *Princes*; as being a thing, which equally concerns them all; Nor can the Doctor produce an inſtance of a former fact in this kind. And, if the Prince can thus free his National Clergy from a *Patriarch*, and his Synod; why not alſo from a *General Council*; that neither it ſhall oblige his Subjects without his conſent? Again: Doctor *Heylin's* Plea † touching the *Engliſh* Clergy, in their Reformation, their conferring all their power on the Prince, which they formerly enjoyed in their own capacity; *A power* (ſaith he) *not only of confirming their Synodical acts, not to be put in execution without his conſent; but in effect, to devolve on him all that power, which formerly they enjoyed in*

‖ §. 55.

† *Anſw. to Schiſm Diſarmed*, p. 178.

† *Reformation juſtified*, p. 84.

in their own capacity [comparing it there to the *Roman Senat's* transferring all their power on *Cæsar*], I must say, this Plea, as it contains very strange Doctrine; so it reacheth not our present matter; for, if a National Clergy can, at pleasure, transfer their own *spiritual authority* over others, and that authority too for *reforming Errors* in matters of *Religion*, to a *Lay* person, or also to his Delegates; which authority was entrusted to them, by our *Lord*, in a *Personal Ordination*; yet can they not hence transfer to the same Lay-person, their Superior's whether person's or Council's, *spiritual* authority *over them*, so that this Superior's authority, for the future, shall not oblige, but when such Lay-person first admits it.

§. 64. This (from §. 53.) of Obedience due, from the *Reformed*, and particularly from the Church of *England*, to the Council of *Trent*, if this were only a free, and Legal, *Patriarchal* Council. The true Rights of which also it may not be thought to forfeit by its further pretensions to be a Council *Oecumenical*; As we may not withdraw our due obedience from our Prince, when he exacts some other not due; or withhold a just debt, where more is unjustly demanded: But, not to stay here;

§. 65. 2. 2ly. Our Obedience may, yet further, be rightly challenged to this Council, as *General*, if it shall be proved, though not so General, as several formerly have been; yet, so General, as now, in such an alteration of States, can be had; and it being such, the same Divine assistance, as to ampler formerly, may be presumed to be afforded to it, for such Controversies as are necessary to be decided. And a submission to a Council only so comprehensive several *Protestant* Divines think reasonable. Thus Bp. *Bramhal*, in Preface to *Reply* to *Chalced.* -- *I submit my self to the Representative Church, a free General Council, or so General, as can be procured.* And *Schism-guarded*, p. 136. --- *There is nothing* (saith he) *that we long after more, than a General Council rightly called, rightly proceeding; or, in defect of that, a free Occidental Council, as General as may be.* And *p.* 351. -- *I shall be ever ready to acquiesce in the determination of a Council so General, as is possible to be had.* See more, in *Disc.* 1. §. 35. Dr. *Field* freely confesseth ‖ -- *That the Decrees of* Popes, *made with the consent and joint concurrence of the other* Western *Bishops, do bind the Western Provinces that are subject to him, as* Patriarch *of the* West. [Bind them so, as that these have no liberty to contradict the Judgment of the *Patriarch*, and his Council, as appears, *Ibid. c.* 39. *p.* 563. Where, he quotes the *Emperor's* Law, (*Novel.* 223. *c.* 22.) confirming the 9th. Canon of the Council of *Chalcedon.*--*Nullâ parte ejus sententiæ contradicere valente*: Consequently, these Councils bind so the Church of *England*. Dr. *Hammond* saith: † --- *That General Councils are now morally impossible to be had, the Christian world being under so many Empires, and divided into so many Communions, that it is not visible to the eye of man, how they should be regularly assembled.* But mean while he saith: ‖ --- *We acknowledge the due authority of our Ecclesiastical Superiors, profess Canonical obedience to them, submit to their Censures, and Decrees; and give our selves up to be ruled by them in all things, secundum Deum.* And, (Answ. to *Cathol. Gentleman*, p. 17.) --- *A Congregation* (saith he) *that is fallible may yet have*

‖ *Of the Church.* p. 557.

† *Answ. to Catholick Gent.* p. 30.

‖ *Of Schism,* c. p. 163.

have authority to make decisions, and to require Inferiors so far to acquiesce to their Determinations, as not to disquiet the peace of that Church with their contrary opinions. [All which seems to amount to his acknowledging an external obedience of non-contradiction at least, and such, as *Protestants* contend for to their *National* Synods, to be due to a *Patriarchal*, or the highest, Assembly of Church-Governors which the present, or future times, in the moral impossibility of having *General* Councils, are capable of].

§. 66. 3.

3ly. The absence in it of the *Representatives* of the *Eastern Patriarchs*, and Churches, (the thing *principally* urged) seems no just hinderance why this council of *Trent* may not be stiled *General*. For evidencing which, I desire you to consider with me these Reasons, in part cleared before.

1st. That a Council may be stiled *General* without the presence in it of some considerable Churches ‖; either, 1. When these, called by a lawful Authority, by reason of poverty, and distance of place, or persecution, *&c*, cannot come; and afterward, acquainted with the Council's proceedings, express no dissent to the Acts thereof. See before, §. 36. the four first Councils, as convened for the suppressing of Heresies that chiefly afflicted the *Eastern* parts, so mostly consisting of *Oriental* Bishops, scarce any of the *West* being present in some of them. Or 2. When, invited, and no way justly letted, they refuse to come; Or 3. When, by some former *General* Council condemned of Heresie, and Schisme, they are not invited at all to come; or, coming, are repelled. For, the *Church Catholick* may be much narrower than *Christianity* †: and Councils are *General*, and obligatory as such, if they consist of the Church Catholick, though it should be reduced only to one *Patriarchate*. 2ly. Concerning the Calling of the *Eastern* Churches (not entring here into that Controversie, whether these Churches do not maintain an *Heresie* in the *Procession of the H. Ghost*, and become by this disenabled, and deprived, of a Vote in Councils; ‖ or, are not guilty of a *Schisme*, at least since the accord made in the Council of *Florence*) it appears; that both in the first assembling of this Council at *Trent*, by *Paul* the Third, and again, at the renewing of it by *Pius* the Fourth, in general, all Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops, *&c*, who by Law, or priviledge, have voice in *General* Councils, were invited and called to it; for so ran the *Bulls* of the *Indiction* of it: (See *Soave's* History of the Council of *Trent*, *l.* 1. *p.* 101. & *l.* 5. *p.* 435). 3ly. There was an actual War, for a great part of the time of this Council, between the *Christians*, and the *Turks*; wherein *Charles* the Fifth twice invaded *Africk*; once victorious, and once beaten; during which War, we may guess how hard, and dangerous a thing it would have been for these *Eastern* Bishops, or *Patriarchs*, in the *Turkish* Territory, to have resorted to any Assembly, either in his, or in his Enemie's, Dominions; *It is ot credible* (saith Bp. *Bramhal* †) *that the* Turk *will send his Subjects, that is, four of the Proto-Patriarchs, with their Clergy, to a General Council; or allow them to meet openly with the rest of Christendom in a* General *Council; it being so much against his own Interest.* But, had there been peace; yet, in so great *distance*, and so great *poverty* of those Churches, their assistance, in any great number, could not have been

‖ See, before, §. 36, & 43. 1.

† See before, §. 39. 2.

‖ See before, §. 43. 3.

† *Schism Guarded*, p. 352.

expected; neither is it probable, in the differences they have with the *Roman* Church, (though the chief points concluded in *Trent* against *Protestants* are none of these) that they would have trusted the negotiation of their affairs to a few. And; upon such considerations as these, I suppose it was, That the *Reformed*, in the Articles they proposed to the *Emperor*, || concerning a free Council to which they would submit, require not this presence of the *Eastern* Churches, or Patriarchs in it, as a condition of their submission to it; for indeed, in such a conjunction of affairs, as was then, this would have discovered in them a plain tergiversation. 4ly. But 4ly. Since the Division, that caused the convening of this Assembly, arose only in the *West*, and did not disturbe at all the peace of the *Eastern* Churches, who were, for the most of the points controverted in this Council, against the new Separatists, united in opinion, amongst themselves, and with the *Western* Churches; there is also, from this, a fairer Apology to be made for their absence, and little reason to put them to so great a trouble, and charge. 5ly. Though these absent, their judgment concerning the matters decided in this Council *against* the *Reformed*, excepting a very few, though not delivered in any *Provincial* Synods, then called for that purpose, which Synods in such a desolation of that Church could then hardly be convened, yet is sufficiently manifested, both in their publick Liturgies, and other modern Writings, and also, for several points, in former *Western* Councils, wherein the Representatives of these Western Churches have appeared to have agreed with it. Of which, see what is said in *Disc.* 1. §. 34.---- & *Disc.* 3. §. 158, *&c.* Especially see the Answer of *Jeremias* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, returned about some ten years after this Council of *Trent* was ended (I think, I may say, by God's special Providence) to the *Wirtemberg* Divines (where the *Reformation* first began): who sent to him the *Augustan Confession*; and invited him to an union of their two Churches; and, to induce him the easilier to it; professed their acceptation, together with the *Greek* Church, of the *seven* first *General* Councils. [Their words are †---- *Illam quæ à Sanctis Apostolis, & Prophetis, & Spiritum Sanctum habentibus Patribus, ac Patriarchis, & super divinas Literas ædificatis septem Synodis, tradita est, fidem amplectentes.* To whom He; ‖---- *Respondebimus ergo, nihil nostrum afferentes; sed ex Sanctis septem Oecumenicis Synodis (quas & vobis probari rectè scribitis), & ex sententiâ Sanctorum,* &c.] Unto every Article of which *Augustane* Confession, the *Patriarch* returned his Judgment, as consonant to other modern *Greek* Writers, so scarce in any thing differing from the *Tridentine* Decrees.

|| *Soave, l.* 7. p. 642. & 367.

† *Acta Theol. Wirtemb. Epist.*

‖ 1. *Respons.*

After this first assault made upon the *Greek* Church by the new *Reformation*, thus repulsed by the Patriarch *Jeremy*; In later times, by the diligent Negotiations of some *Protestant* Agents there, the *Reformed* Tenents made a second fair appearance in the *East*, and sollicited an Acceptation of them in the *Greek* Churches, and had prospered so far, as that in *A. D.* 1629, *Cyril Lucar*, first, Patriarch of *Alexandria*, and then, of *Constantinople*, published a Confession of Faith, in several points, though somewhat obscurely, favouring *Calvinisme*, and opposite to the Decrees of *Trent*; which Confession he set forth, as owned, not only by Himself, but the whole *Greek* Church. But, upon

upon this ſecond Alarm, as it were, given unto the *Greeks*, no ſooner was this *Cyril*, by a violent death, removed out of the Chair, but his immediate Succeſſor, *Cyril ab Iberiâ*, in the ſame year 1639, aſſembled ſuch a Synod, as, in ſuch a poſture of things, could well be procured, at *Conſtantinople*; wherein were alſo preſent the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, and of *Jeruſalem*, and 23. Biſhops: and again, his Succeſſor *Parthenius*, A. D. 1642. convened another, wherein were 25. Biſhops; and amongſt theſe, the *Metropolitan* of *Moſcovy*, both which Synods pronounced *Anathema* to *Cyril Lucar*; declared his *Confeſſion Calviniſtical*, and excommunicated all thoſe, who by word, or writing, ſhould own, or defend it: In which Synods alſo, againſt the Articles of this Confeſſion are juſtified ſeveral of thoſe Tenents, which were before decreed, againſt the *Reformed*, by this Council of *Trent*: and namely theſe; *Tranſubſtantiation*, or a *Corporal Preſence of Chriſt's Body and Blood with the Symboles*; *Invocation of Saints*; *Veneration of Sacred Images*; *Prayer*, and *Alms*, *for the Faithful Deceaſed with Repentance*, as betterable in their preſent Condition, by them; *Free-will*; the *Seven Sacraments*; *Church-Infallibility*, &c. † Again, by occaſion of a late Controverſie happening in *France* between *Anton. Arnauld* a *Sorbon* Doctor, and Mr. *Claude* a *French* Miniſter on this Subject, many more Teſtimonies, bearing a very late Date, of ſeveral Prelates, and other Clergy have been, (upon ſollicitation,) receiv'd out of the *Eaſt*, all conſpiring with the *Decrees* of this *Council*, as to the Points, they had occaſion to ſpeak of, ſuch as be thoſe forenamed; to which may be added, *Adoration of Chriſt's Body and Blood in the Euchariſt*; *Evangelical Counſels*, *Monaſtick Vows*, *the Church's Hierarchy*, &c. See a diligent Collection of them in Dr. *Arnauld's* Anſwer to *Claude*, l. 4. --- and in the *Appendix* to his *Book*, *l.* 12. And indeed ſuch an Eye to, and Reverence of, the *Orientals* had the Council of *Trent*, that, in ſeveral paſſages, it ſeems to take great care, * of Anathematizing any ſuch Doctrines, as were in thoſe parts commonly received, (Of which, ſee ſomething below, §. 186,) or, * of giving them any occaſion to proteſt againſt it. This ſaid of the abſence of the *Greeks*;

† *See* Leo Allatius, *de perpetuo conſenſu*, *l.* 3. —Arnauld's *Anſ. to* Claud. *l.* 4. *c.* 7.

4ly. Neither doth the *abſence* of the *Proteſtant-Clergy* hinder this of *Trent* from being a *Lawful* and *obliging*, *Patriarchal*, or alſo *General*, Council. §. 67.

1. Firſt; Not the *abſence* of ſo many of them, as were no *Biſhops*; becauſe they had no right to ſit, or vote there; if we may be ſuffered to model that of *Trent* according to *former General*, and approved, Councils. 4. 1.

2. Nor the *voluntary*, and *un-neceſſitated* abſence of ſuch of them as were *Biſhops*; though thoſe of a whole Province, or Nation, be ſo abſent; if *invited*; if *ſecured*, (as the Proteſtants were: See below, §. 92, &c.) and yet not coming. For (as hath been ſhewed) in Councils, as the *Vote*, ſo the *Preſence*, of ſome Biſhops from a *major* part of Chriſtian Provinces, and a like *Acceptation* of its Acts after the Council concluded, is ſufficient to nominate the Council *General*, and render its Acts obliging; or elſe farewel *General* Councils, and their power. For, theſe being ordinarily aſſembled for the rectifying of ſome part peccant, when will not ſuch Biſhops as are *heterodoxe*, fearing ſome cenſure, or ill ſucceſs, from the reſt out-numbring them, pur- 2.

posely *absent* themselves? or, such *Princes*, as are any way obnoxious (as *Henry* 8. was, having assumed a new Church-Supremacy) not prohibit them? Of this, thus Archbishop *Laud*, §. 27. n. 4. --- *Such a promulgation, as is morally sufficient to give notice, that such a Council is called, is sufficient in case of Contumacy; and, where they, who are called and refuse to come, have no just cause for their not coming.* And D. *Field* ‖ forbears not to pronounce the 5th. Council held at *Constantinople* under the Emperor *Justinian*, A. D. 553, *General*: when as yet the *Prime Patriarch*, and his *Western* Bishops, were neither *present* in it, at least any considerable number of them; nor, in absence, had *approved* it; *General*; *i. e.* in case (saith he) of their wilful refusal. See his words set down before, §. 43. Some other cause therefore must be urged, and not this barely of their absence, why the Council is not without them legally *General*, or obliging. 3. Nor doth the *involuntary absence* of some *Bishops*, if hindered by some secular power, or also, if not admitted, or excluded, by the Council, hinder it from being *Legitimate*; if the excluded be proved such, as profess, and own, those Opinions, that have been *condemned*, and the defenders thereof anathematized, by *former* lawful Councils. Now, whether the *Protestant* party might justly have been excluded upon this Title, see below, §. 198. Nay further; For those Bishops, who are not yet condemned by any former Church-Decree; yet, if they be *accused*, or *suspected* of some new dangerous Errour, it hath not been unusual, in former allowed Councils (the major part thereof so agreeing) to deny them the liberty of *sitting*, or giving their *vote*, therein, till first, by the judgment of the Council, they be cleared of it, For which see the Proceedings against *Dioscorus* Bishop of *Alexandria*, and his chief Adherents in the 4th. *General* Council, *Act.* 1.

‖ P. 651.

§. 68. n. 1.

Yet, notwithstanding such just pretensions of excluding the *Protestant* Divines from the Council of *Trent*, *de facto* they were not so. But had granted to them, --- *Plenissimam securitatem* (as their Safe-Conduct, *Sess.* 18, expresseth it) *veniendi, proponendi, loquendi, -- Articulos quoslibet tam scripto, quàm verbo liberè offerendi, eosque Scripturis Sacris, & Beatorum Patrum Sententiis, & rationibus, astruendi -- ad objecta Concilii Generalis respondendi*, &c. (See also that Safe Conduct, before this, *Sess.* 13). And some *Protestant* Divines appeared in this Council upon such *security* ‖. But, behold, within three Weeks after their arrival there, the *Protestant Princes*, that had sent these to trear, here, an *Union* of *Religion*, and the *Peace* of Christendom, appear in *Arms*; on a sudden, invade the *Emperor*, secure, and wholly unprovided; and narrowly saving himself from their Hands, by flight from *Isprucke*, at midnight. And their victorious Arms, now not far distant from *Trent*, and a rumor spread, that they would suddenly possess themselves of the *Alpes*, to hinder the entrance of forreign Forces, struck the Council with such a terror, that they were necessitated to suspend it, for some time, and seek their safety by a dispersion of their Members: Nor did the Council, by reason of the tumults in *Germany*, and wars in *Italy*, and *France* †, meet again, till ten years after this, in the beginning of *Pius* the fourth; after that the *Reformed Religion* had received an incredible growth in those troublesom, and distracted,

‖ See *Soave*, p. 374, 375.

† *Conc. Trid. Bulla celebrat. Conc. Sess.* 17.

cted, times; wherein, by the *Emperor's* being conſtrain'd to grant a *Toleration*, the Evil one had much more advantage to ſow his Tares (as alſo, at its firſt birth, *Proteſtantiſme* was cheriſhed with a like Toleration, by reaſon of the *Invaſions* of the *Turk*, and the Aids, againſt Him, neceſſary from the *Proteſtant's* party). No ſooner had *Pius* renewed the Council, but there was another *Safe-Conduct* for *Proteſtants* publiſhed, like that under *Julius*, but not made uſe of.

But let us, now, ſuppoſe the Council undiſturbed in the manner before related, and theſe *Proteſtant* Divines that came to the Council, ſtill continuing there, and indulged not only [1] the freedom of *Diſputing*, but [2] their *Deciſive Vote*, [Touching which thing ſee the Caution premiſed by the Council ||; That, if, for that time, the *Proteſtants* were permitted to give a *Placet*, it ſhould be no prejudice to the Rights, or Honour of the preſent, or future, Councils; which ſhews the Council not reſolved to deny this to them, if much ſtood upon]; Yet what leaſt advantage (to repeat here again ſomething ſaid already in the firſt *Diſc.* §. 36. n. 3) could *Proteſtants* have extracted from theſe? For the firſt; their *Freedom* of *Diſputing* and perſwading: What could they now have ſaid, after a thirty years growth of their Doctrine, that they had not formerly written, and the Council peruſed? And with what face could they have declined the expoſition of *Scriptures*, by former Eccleſiaſtical *Tradition*, *Councils*, and *Fathers*, by which they were caſt? For the latter; their power of *Voting*: What ſignified their number to that of *Catholick* Biſhops? Or, if the Votes were changed from *Perſonal*, to *National*, ſtill leſs relief to them from hence; eſpecially, if ſuch *Nations* be conſidered, in a due proportion, according to the multitude of their *Clergy*. Which the *Proteſtants* well diſcerned, when waving any ſuch trial, *i. e.* of *Eccleſiaſtical* matters by *Eccleſiaſtical* Judges, they propoſed rather a Deciſion by *Laicks* indifferently choſen in an equal number, on both ſides, † By which bargain, they were ſure not to loſe their Cauſe, if only thoſe nominated by them, did not *vote* againſt them. Was it not then a much wiſer courſe to forbear coming to this Council at all, and to plead it *non-General* by their *abſence*, when as the proceedings thereof could no way have been defeated or changed, by their preſence? This, for the *Abſence* of the *Proteſtant* Clergy.

§. 68. n. 2.

|| *Apud Binnium, Conc. Trid. Seſſ.* 15.

† *See Soave, p.* 369.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

5. *That this Council is not hindred from being* General, *by the absence of the Roman-Catholick Bishops of some Province, or Nations*, §. 69.

Where

1. *Of the reasen of the Paucity of Bishops in some* Sessions, §. 70.
2. *Of the Ratification of the Acts of those* Sessions *by the fuller Council under* Pius. §. 75.
3. *Of the Acceptation of the whole Council by the absent Prelacy*, §. 77. *And particularly: Concerning the Acceptation thereof by the* French *Church*, *Ib.*

§. 69. 5ly. NEither doth the *Absence* of many of the *Roman-Catholick Bishops*; or of the Bishops of some one *Roman-Catholick* Prince (provided there be a personal presence of some Bishops, authorized from a major part of *Catholick* Princes), hinder this Council from being lawfully *Patriarchal*, or *General*, for some of the Reasons given but now, (§. 67). To which may be added these further *Considerations* to remove any prejudice raised to this Council from the paucity of the number of Bishops in it (especially in some *Sessions*) in comparison of some former *General* Councils.

§. 70. 1. 1. The first *Consideration* is, That, this Council, beyond any former, having so many *Points* of *Doctrine* and *Discipline* to examine, wherein the *Reformed* contradicted the immediate-former common tradition, and practice; and being drawn out for so long a time; beginning in 1545, and ending in 1563; actually sitting for some four years, it cannot rationally be expected; that such a *frequency* of Bishops should continually attend it, as if it had been convened for deciding some *single Controversie*, and suddenly concluded. But, in so long a Service, much complaint there was (especially amongst the poorer sort) of their great expences; more, of the neglect of their several Churches; and, after a while, great longing after their own Country, Relations, Houses; and therefore, frequently, some stealing away from the *Council*, without the leave, and consent, of the rest.

§ 71. 2. 2. That, whereas the Council several times complained, (especially in the fourth, fifth, and sixth *Sessions*) and intended to proceed to Censures, against the Bishops that were absent, (in which Council the greatest scarcity was of the *Bishops* of *France*, and *Germany*,) at several times both the *French King's*, and *Emperor's*, Embassadors *excused* their absence to the Council, for some time at least, from the necessity there was to retain them at home, for the defence of the *Catholick* Religion, against the endeavours

deavours and tumults, of the *Calvinists* in *France*, and of the *Lutherans* in *Germany*. See *Pallav.* l. 5. c. 15. n. 5. —— l. 6. c. 16. *Soave*, p. 509. 552.

[1] For the *French* Bishops; 'tis true, that three of them only attended the beginning of the Council, the Archbishop of *Renes*, the Archbishop of *Aix*, and another, One of which (*Renes*) returned upon the *King's* Summons, before the first *Session* of the Council; but more Bishops from time to time were promised to be sent from thence, (see *Soave*, p. 143); and, after some time, were sent, when the Council, for fear of the Plague, was removed from *Trent* to *Bologna* ‖. And in the time of the Council's sitting afterward at *Trent*, under *Pius* the Fourth, the King of *France* sent thither the *Cardinal* of *Lorraine*, and 14. Bishops, who sate in Council, and 18. select *Divines*, most of them *Sorbon-Doctors*, maintained there at the *King's* charge †.

‖ *Spendan. A.* 1545. *n.* 17. — *Pallavic. l.* 6. *c.* 1. *n* 10. — *l.* 10. *c.* 7. *n.* 2. — *c.* 2. *n.* 6.
† *Pallav. l.* 18. *c.* 17. *n.* 21.

§. 72.

[2] As for the *German Bishops*; because in the beginning of the Council it was thought necessary, that they should be detained at home, at least many of them, to defend the *Roman-Catholick* Cause in the frequent *Diets* there; and because, in *Pius* his time, they were partly terrified with the threats of *Hostility* upon their Estates from the *Protestants*, then very powerful, if they should offer to go to *Trent* (as the *Emperor's* Embassadors in the Council pleaded for them), therefore there was not so great an appearance at any time of them in the Council, though nearer than many others; and they were dispensed with to appear by *Proxies*; though indeed it was, for some Reasons, denied to all Proxies, (non-Bishops), to have in the Council any *definitive* Vote ‖. But, mean while; these *German* Prelates, in their several Treaties with the *Protestants* in these *Diets*, without yielding any thing to them, that was contrary to the Conciliar Acts (for which see the Relation made by *Soave* of these *Diets*) do shew a *concurrence*, in all points, of their *judgments* with the others, who sate in *Council*.

‖ *Pallav l.* 5. *c.* 15. *n.* 5. *l.* 7. *c.* 13. — *l.* 20. *c.* 17. *n.* 7 — *l.* 23. *c.* 5. *n.* 4.

§. 73.

3. That open discords and *wars* breaking out, several times, between several Princes, during the sitting of this Council, especially between the *Pope*, and the *Emperor*, and King of *France*; as likewise *Civil Wars* between the *Lutherans*, and *Catholicks*, in the same Prince's Dominions, hindred, sometimes the *Bishops* of one Nation, sometimes of another, from attending the Council. The *Princes* also upon another account *sent not*, or *recalled* their Bishops, as they had some Differences with the *Pope*; or feared, that their secular interest might any way suffer in the Council.

3.

See the *Emperor* restraining his Prelates from the Council when translated from *Trent* to *Bologna*, upon pretence of the place too remote, for setling the affairs of *Germany*, and for the convenience of the *German* Bishops, (who had so great Charges,) their repairing thither. (*Soave*, p. 274). But, see the true cause (*Soave* p. 261), if we may believe him; where he saith,— *The Emperor* [Charles 5.] *was much displeased at this Translation of the Council, because he saw a weapon* [*i. e.* the Council] *taken out of his hand* [*i. e.* from *Trent*, which City was in his power] *by managing whereof, according to opportuni-*

ty,

ty, he thought to set Religion at peace in Germany, *and so to put it under his obedience.*

So, see the King of *France*, *Henry* 2. in *Julius* his time, with whom he had a contest about *Parma*, protesting against the Council in *Trent*, and refusing to send his Bishops thither, upon pretence, that they could not pass safely, neither through the *Pope's* Territories, with whom he had war; nor through the *Emperor's*, a Confederate with the *Pope* (*Soave*, p. 319, 320). But see the true Cause (*Soave*, p. 315.) --- *The King hoping, that such Protestation against the Council would remove the Pope* [from his resolutions concerning *Parma*]: *and the fear of such disturbance to the proceedings of the Council make him yield the controversie about* Parma. Which Controversie lasting for some time longer, and the Council at *Trent* being dissolved within a year, by reason of the *Protestant's* in *Germany* taking *Arms*, hence no *French Bishops* were present in the Council for its *Sessions* under *Julius*. *But this protestation of the King, and absence of the French Bishops, the Imperialists* (*saith* Soave, *p.* 320) *esteemed a vanity: because the Act of the major part of the Universality is ever esteemed lawful, when the lesser, being called, either cannot, or will not be present.* Yet, he saith, *that the Parliament of* Paris *was of a contrary judgment*, viz. *that in Ecclesiastical Assemblies, where the whole belongeth to all, and every one hath his part, the assent of every one is necessary; Et, prohibentis conditio potior, and the absent, not giving their voices, are not bound to receive such a Council.* In answer to whom, *Pallavicino* † as easily denies, that *Parliament* to have said, or held, any such thing, as applied to *Ecclesiastical affairs*: (else; in a possession, wherein there are many partners, or sharers, this rule is very true): But, whatever that Lay-Parliament held; it is so exploded a conceit, this, [that the assent of *every one* is necessary, or else the *major* part of the Council doth not oblige him; by which no *Arian* Bishop is obliged to obey the Council of *Nice*] that I count it lost time to confute it.

† *l.* 11. *c.* 18. §. 7.

See, again, the *French King*; in *Pius* the Fourth's time, upon the Council's beginning to agitate the *Reformation* of *Secular* Princes, as to their infringing the priviledges of the *Church*, giving order, that his Bishops should absent themselves from the Council; but the *King*, being better informed by the *Cardinal* of *Lorrain's* Letter to him, and those Articles of *Reformation* of *Princes*, because so offensive, being no further proceeded in, the *French Bishops* withdrew not themselves; save some few, upon their private occasions; but continued in it, till the end of the Council †.

† *Pallavic. l.* 23. *c.* 1. — *Soave, p.* 783, 784, 798.

§. 74.

4. That in those *Sessions*, wherein there were but *few* Bishops, as in the fourth, fifth, sixth *Sessions* under *Paul* the Third, yet there was besides them a choice *Collection* of other *Divines*; some of the most famous for Learning, and Writings, which that age afforded; which *Divines*, though they had no *decisive Votes* in the Session; yet were they constantly consulted-with, in the preparatory *Congregations*, and nothing ordinarily passed without their preceding Conferences, and long, and diligent disquisitions; such, I believe, as cannot be matched in the Records of any former Council. See * the manner of their proceeding in *Soave*, p. 198. and ' the testimony he gives them,

p. 150.

p. 150. --*That, though, at the first, they seemed in the Council only to make Sermons,* &c, *yet, when that controverted Doctrines were to be decided, and the abuses of Learned men, rather than of others, to be reformed, their worth began to appear.* Likewise, beside these Bishops, and other Divines in *Trent*, there was also, in the time of the forenamed *Sessions*, a great number of *Cardinals, Bishops*, and choice *Divines*, and *Canonists*, at *Rome*, assisting the *Pope*, and consulted by him, upon all new occasions of informing his *Legates* in *Trent*. So that, even in the meanest attendance of the Bishops in this place, it was not so contemptible a Conventicle, as many would make believe. Nor are the persons, then Resident, and acting in the Council, so much *vilified* by one side, but that they are as much *exalted* by another.

[Thus *Soave* falls upon that part of the Council, which seems most weakly guarded, the *Fourth Session*, in his *p.* 163. --- *That some thought it strange; that five Cardinals, and forty eight Bishops, should so easily define the most principal and important Points of Religion, never decided before.* --- *Neither was there amongst those Prelates any one remarkable for Learning, some of them Lawyers, perhaps Learned in their Profession, but of little understanding in Religion; few Divines, but of less than ordinary, sufficiency; the greater number Gentlemen, or Courtiers; and, for their Dignities, some only titular; and the major part, Bishops of small Cities: particularly of* Germany *not so much as one Bishop, or Divine.* So *Soave*.

And *Pallavicino* gives him this repulse, *l.* 6. *c.* 17. *n.* 12, &c. --- *That what the Bishops then said in the Congregations, which is to be seen in many other Libraries besides the* Vatican, *sufficiently sheweth their great Learning. That there were only* 48. *Bishops indeed, but these not of small Churches, as* Soave *supposeth. Besides that every one of the Cardinals (besides* Poole*) had noble Bishopricks; and most of them, more than one, as was usual in those days, But, which is more, that these Prelates were choice persons out of* Italy, Sicily, Sardinia, France, *and* Spain, *sent thither by the Supreme Authority. Besides whom there were some from* Dalmatia, Greece, Sweden, Scotland. *That the three Legates* were all excellent Persons, and two of them greatly skilled in the learned *languages* [to the ignorance of which Tongues *Soave* imputes the passing of the Determination made in that *Session*, in behalf of the *Vulgar* Translation] Cervini *especially; who then, from time to time, communicated his doubts with* Sirletus, *then Keeper of the* Vatican *Library, afterwards* Cardinal; *besides the Legates,* Madruccius, *and* Pacecus, *were of the greatest, and most renowned persons, that were in* Germany, *or* Spain. *To these Bishops were adjoined three Abbots to represent the* Benedictine *Order, and the five Generals of the* Mendicant *Orders, all men of great Learning, as* Soave *frequently, though against his will, confesseth, in his recitations of their Discourses; and (if we make any account of the persons represented by them), it was no small matter, that, in this Council, besides others, were, then, the Heads of almost all the encloistred Families, who are so considerable a part of the Church, and, in fine, the chief Conservatory, and Receptacle of* Theology. --- *There assisted this Synod at that time, for Counsellors, at least forty Divines* ‖ *of the ablest that were then in Christendom, and many of whom have illustrated that Age with their Writings, and much exalted it, for Theological Learning, above many preceding.* [Such were *Soto, Oleastro, Caterino,*

‖ See Soave. p. 194.

rino, Castro, Vega, &c.]. *It is true; that there were no* Germans *there: But what marvel, if these Prelates came not to the Council, who were then in a fight; at that very time a* Diet *being held; and, a little before it, the Colloquy at* Ratisbone. *For whose sakes therefore it was, that* Madruccius, *and* Toledo, Cesar's *Embassadors, opposed the Accusation, in the Council, of the contumacy of the Absents. Yet were the matters of the Council conferred with these* German *Prelates by* Letters; *and their Answers read, and the aids of their Pen, though not of their Tongue, afforded to the Council.* Thus the *one* exalts, as the *other* depresseth. The Discourses, which are set down in these two *Historians*, as likewise the Writings of several of them now extant, may best inform you of their Abilities.] As for the matters decided in this 4th. *Session*, though *Soave* represents here the people of *Germany* as much *aggravating* them; yet, as if he had
‖ p. 164. forgotten himself, in the next page ‖ he brings in the *Pope* as much slighting them, and admonishing his Legates -- *That they should not spend time in matters not controverted, as they had done in those handled the last Session*, [i. e. the Fourth] *wherein all agree, that they are undoubted Principles.* The Decision, therefore, only of points amongst *Catholicks* universally received, as it had not, so needed not, the *confluence* of so great a *Body*.

§. 75. 5. But, 5ly. Let the *paucity* of the Bishops there, or the *absence* of the Representatives of some whole *Nation Catholick*, be never so prejudicial to the Acts of some former *Sessions* of this Council under *Paul*, or *Julius*; yet an amends is made for it in the times of *Pius*; when a much fuller body of *Fathers* (in all, of those who subscribed in the end of the Council, 255. the *Seven Generals* of the *Religious* Orders, and the *Seven Abbots*, being included) and, amongst them, a *Mission* of *Bishops* from those Catholick *Princes*, who were formerly deficient, (and these Bishops assisted with a very great number of the most Learned Divines, selected out of all *Christian* Countries, and *Religious* Orders, the Catalogue of whom is printed at the end of the Council) did *review* and *ratifie* all, that those fewer had formerly *enacted*; and by their reading first, and then subscribing to, the Acts of the whole Council from the beginning thereof, 1545, added that strength to those Acts, which they may be thought, from such a *paucity*, formerly to have wanted. Of which *Ratification*, even by the *French* among the rest, thus *Soave*, p. 804 -- *Afterward a Proposition was made for the Reading, in Session*, [the last Session] *of all the* Decrees *made under* Paul, *and* Julius, *to be approved; which* Modena *opposed, saying; it would be a derogation to the authority of the Council of those times, if it should seem that the things then done had need of a new confirmation of the Fathers; and would shew, that this and that was not all one, because none can confirm his own things. Others said, it was necessary to do it, for that cause, that authority might not be taken from them, by saying they were not of the same Council. And the same Frenchmen, who before did so earnestly desire, that it might be declared, that the Council was new, and not continuated with that under* Paul *and* Julius, *did now labour more than others, that there might be taken away all cause of any doubting, that all the Acts from the year 1545. until the end, were not of the same Synod. Thus it happeneth, as in humane Affairs, so in Religion also; that one's credulity is changed with his interest. Therefore now, all aiming at one mark,*

it

it was determined, ſimply to read them and ſay no more; for ſo the unity of the Council was moſt plainly declared; and all difficulties removed, which the word [Confirmation] *might bring, leaving every one to think what he liſted, whether the reading of them did conſequently import a Confirmation, or Declaration of their validity; or an inference, that it was* one *Synod, which made, with that, which read, them*; [and therefore, being owned as Acts of the *ſame* Body, they needed no more confirmation in the 25th. *Seſſion* thereof, than the Acts of the 23*d*. or 24*th*. *Seſſion* did]. Here then we ſee, either *confirmed*, or *owned*, thoſe Acts were by all, none oppoſing any of them as erroneous, or faulty; and then; the controverſie, whether they were thus approved and acknowledged, as the acts of one, and the ſame Council; or, as the Acts of ſeveral; (as the *Emperor* ſignified to his Embaſſadors, *apud Pallav*. l. 24. c. 8. n. 7.) is not much material. [And indeed, the former endeavours of the *French*, not *Prelates*, but *Miniſters* of *State*, as alſo, of the *Emperor's*, at the firſt opening of the Council under *Pius*, That this Council then might not be declared a *Continuation* of the former Council, was not at all from any diſlike of the former Decrees: But partly; that by this the *Proteſtants* (whoſe reduction theſe Princes much intended) might not be diſcouraged from appearing in this Council under *Pius*†; and the *French* doing it alſo partly, for maintaining the honour of the *Proteſtation* of the *French* King, *Henry* 2, againſt the ſitting of this Council under *Julius*: though this alſo out of no quarrel to any thing done in the Council, then, but, the pretence of no ſecurity in ſending his Biſhops to it, by reaſon of the *Pope*'s warring upon *Parma*, which he endeavoured by all means to divert.†] *After this* [ſaith *Soave*. p. 813.]. *the* Secretary *going into the midſt did interrogate, whether in the name of the Council a* Confirmation *ſhould be demanded of* Pius *of all things decreed under* Paul, Julius, *and His* Holineſs. *And they anſwered, not one by one, but all together*, Placet. So ſaith *Soave*. But *Pallavicino*. (l. 24. c. 8. n. 8.) proves by ſeveral teſtimonies, that the Votes were here given, as uſually; one by one: One only, the Archbiſhop of *Granata*, a *Spaniard*, diſſenting, as holding the *Acts* of the *Council* valid without any further *confirmation*. And the great unanimity of the *Council*, when drawing toward an end, is elſewhere ſufficiently intimated by *Soave*, p. 782. a little before the 24th. *Seſſion*, where he ſaith:-- *Here I muſt make a great mutation of ſtile. For, whereas in the former Narration I have uſed that which is proper to deſcribe variety of minds and opinions, one croſſing the deſigne of another*, &c, *hereafter I muſt make relation of one aim only and uniform operations, which ſeem rather to fly, than run to one only end*, &c.

† *Soave*, p. 434. —*Pallav*. l. 15. c. 1. n. 6.

† *Soave*, p 315. 321, 819.

Here then we ſee this *numerous* Body of *Biſhops* (exceeding that, which hath been convened in ſeveral former Councils, confeſſedly *General*) [1] Rehearſing, [2] Subſcribing to, [3] Requeſting from the *Chief Paſtor* of the Church Catholick a *Confirmation* of the *Decrees* of the Council; not only thoſe laſt, under *Pius*; but the former, under *Paul*, and *Julius*, from the beginning, they not particularly re-voting indeed thoſe former Decrees, leſt ſo thoſe ſhould ſeem the *Acts* of *another* Body (the reaſon given for it); but acknowledging them rather, as their own *Acts*; and themſelves, the ſame continued Body with thoſe, that made them: and, in this, the *French Biſhops* as forward, as §. 76.

any: and all this testified by *Soave*; no friend to the Council. And, after all this, is it not strange, that any one should attempt to perswade his Reader †, that these Bishops indeed, using some Artifice, caused the former Decrees to be read, but did not *ratifie*, or *accept*, them? But something was necessary here to be said for those inconsidering persons, with whom speaking last serves for an Answer; since this *Ratification* clears that main *Objection* made by *Protestants* against the *paucity* of Bishops in some of the former *Sessions*; *clears* it, I say, by that common Rule owned also by *Protestants* themselves †; *That in case, some Bishops be not present from some Churches, whether Eastern, or Western* [at the making of the Decrees]; *yet if, upon the publishing those Decrees, they be universally accepted, that doth*, ex post-facto, *make the Council* [I add, or any *Session* thereof] *truly Oecumenical.* Yet, in the last place I need not tell you that, the *Articles* made under *Pius* alone, from *Session* 17. to its Conclusion, the ratification of which is here not questioned, are so *many*, and so *principal*, as that these utterly ruine the *Reformation*, though the rest of the Council, for the paucity of the Representatives, were cassated. Amongst these Decrees are, *The lawfulness of communicating only in one kind*; *Celibacy of Priests*; *Invocation of Saints*; *Veneration of Images*; *Celebration of the Divine Service in a more generally-unknown Tongue*; *the Assertion of Purgatory*; *the Sacrifice of the Mass*; and several others.

† See *Stillingfl. Rat. Acc. p. 496.*

† *Stillingfl. p. 536.*

§. 77. 6. Or 6ly. If this Council under *Pius* also seem not sufficiently numerous, because more than half of them were *Italian* Bishops; yet the full *Acceptation* of this Council afterward, by the Bishops of those Nations, who had sometimes none, and other times but few, Representatives in it, sufficiently repairs this defect also. See before, §. 36, 37. Now, amongst all those Catholick Churches, the *Acceptation* of the *French* is only that which can be doubted of. And, concerning this, you may observe.

1. 1st. That the *Council* was approved by the *whole Roman-Catholick* Clergy of *France*, as well those *absent*, as those *present* in the Council. See for this the many Petitions, made at several times, by the whole *Clergy* assembled, to the *King*, that he would receive it, like the rest of *Catholick* Princes; set down in *Review of Council Trent*, l. 1. c. 2. There, 1576. the Archbishop of *Lyons*, in a General *Assembly* of the *States* holden at *Blois*, doth, in the name of the *State Ecclesiastical* of *France*; speak thus unto the King; ---- *They most humbly desire you, that, according to their more particular Request exhibited in their Remonstrances, you would authorize, and cause to be published the holy and sacred* Council *of* Trent, *which by the advice of so many Learned men, hath diligently sought out all that is necessary to restore the Church to her primitive splendor. Wherein, (Sir) they hope and expect from you, as a most Christian King ---- the assistance of your authority, to put this Reformation in execution.* [where you see the *Clergy* approved the Articles of *Reformation*, as well as *Doctrine.*]: Again, 1579, in a like Assembly of the Clergy at *Melun*, the Bishop of *Bazas* in their name, speaks thus to the King. --- *The Clergy entreateth your Majesty, that it may be lawful for them by your authority to reduce Ecclesiastical Discipline, and reform themselves in good earnest. Among all the Rules of Reformation and Discipline they have pitched upon those which are dictated by the Holy Ghost, and written*

written by the Holy General *Council of* Trent, *in as much as they cannot find any more austere and rigorous, nor more proper for the present malady, and indisposition of all the members of the Body Ecclesiastical: but chiefly because they are tied and bound to all Laws so made by the Catholick Church, upon pain of being reputed Schismatical against the Catholick Apostolick Church of* Rome, *and of incurring the Curse of God, and eternal damnation. Wherefore the Clergy doth most humbly beseech,* &c. A. D. 1582. The Archbishop of *Bourges*, Delegate for the *Clergy* in this cause, spake at *Fountain-bleau*, in this sort. ---*The Council of* Trent *is received, kept, and observed by all Christian* Catholick *Kings and Potentates, this Kingdom only excepted: which hath hitherto deferred the publication and receiving of it, to the great scandal of the* French *Nation, and of the title of* Most Christian, *wherewith your Majesty and your Predecessors have been honoured. So that under colour of some Articles touching the liberty of the* Gallican *Church (which might be mildly allayed by the permission of our H. Father the* Pope) *the staine and reproach of the crime of schisme rests upon your Kingdom amongst other Countries. And this is the cause why the Clergy doth now again most humbly desire,* &c.

A. D. 1585. the same request was renewed in the name of the *Clergy* assembled in the *Abby* of St. *German*, in *Paris*. ---*Not the* Gallican *only, but the whole* Church Catholick *doth summon, intreat and pray you to receive it* [*the Council of* Trent]. ---*No good Christian can or ought ever to make any question, but that the H. Ghost did preside in that company,* &c; *there intervening the authority and command of the Holy* See, *the consent of all* Christian *Princes, who sent their Ambassadours thither, who staid there till the very upshot, without the least dissenting from the Canons and Decrees there published: There being such a number of Archbishops, Bishops, Abbots, and learned men from all parts; yea, not a few Prelates of your own Kingdom, sent thither by the late King your Brother, who having deliberated, consulted, and spoken their opinion freely, did consent and agree to what was there determined.* And (since the writing of the *Review*) *A. D.* 1614. in a General *Assembly* of the *States* at *Paris*, Cardinal *Perron*, and Cardinal *Richlieu*, then Bishop of *Luçon*, prosecuted again the same request: And, though this without success; yet, of the solemn *Acceptation* of this Council the next year after, at least by the *Representatives* of the Clergy, thus *Spondanus*. † ---- *In Generali conventu Cleri Gallicani* Lutetiæ *habito, quod ille nunquam hactenus à Regibus obtinere potuisset frequentissimis precibus, neque etiam in ultimis Comitiis* [1614.] *quamvis & nobilitas vota sua junxisset,* viz. *Ut sacrum* Concilium Tridentinum *Regiâ authoritate promulgaretur in Regno, præstitum, à Cardinalibus, Archiepiscopis, Abbatibus, ac cæteris, qui aderant ex cunctis Regni provinciis Delegatis viris Ecclesiasticis, extitit, quantum in ipsis fuit; dum scilicet unanimi omnium consensu illud recipientes, suis se functionibus observaturos promiserunt, ac jurarunt:* After the same Author had said before in the vindication of his own Country, || --- *Non solum non in Decretis Fidei, ac doctrinæ ab Hæreticis controversæ, ullum unquam fuisse objectum dubium: Sed & ipsa Decreta Reformationis, tam ab Ecclesiasticis suscepta fuisse, quàm etiam, paucis quibusdam exceptis,* [chiefly those Decrees hindering the gratifying Ministers of State with Ecclesiastical Commendams] *singillatim Regiis Constitutionibus recepta, & per Ministros Regios executioni mandata.* These I have transcribed, to shew you the *French Clergy's*, con-

† *In* A. D. 1615. n. 7.

|| A. D. 1615. n. 4.

conformity to this Council, high esteem of it, and reiterated intercessions for it to the King, and to the State; who in Ecclesiastical matters, I think, ought to take them for their *Guides*, and for their *Judges*.

§. 78. 2. Next; That this *Council* was opposed by the *King*, or *Civil State* of *France*, not for any Decrees concerning the matters of *faith*, or *doctrine*, but of *Reformation*, as containing in them something contrary to the *Liberties* of the *Gallican* Church; or rather of the *King* in, or over, the *Gallican* Church; Whilst (I say) there was no exception taken at any point of doctrine; [For that point, of the *Pope's superiority* to a Council, opposed by the *French*, was not decreed at all in *Trent*; whatever *Ferrieres* (in *Soave* p. 818.) saith to the contrary; nor do the words there urged by *Ferrieres* imply so much; nor those, most addicted to the *Pope*, pretend so much. Nay, *Pallavicino* 24. l. 14. c. 12. n. saith, that Pope *Pius*, having nine parts of ten in the Council ready to vote this *superiority*, yet suffered this controversie to rest undetermined, because of the dissent of the *Cardinal* of *Lorraine*, and the *French* Bishops]. Here, then, the *Reformed* cannot plead any disobligation to the Council for these things, wherein the Council is generally accepted by so great a part of the Church, † because that, in some other things, it is, by some particular State, refused.

† See below, §. 147.

§. 79. 3. Again, That those 13. Articles, drawn up concerning *reformation* of *Secular Princes*, set down by *Soave*, p. 769. which, upon his Embassador's complaint, occasioned the *French King's* Protestation, but gave offence likewise to the *Emperour*, and the *Kingdom* of *Spain*, &c || were, upon this resentment of Princes, laid aside; and all that was enacted by the Council, instead of these, concerning Princes, is contained in the 20. *chapter* of *Reformation*, in the last *Session*. ---- *Cupiens Sancta Synodus*, &c. Where you may see, with what great modesty and respect the Council treateth these Secular Supremes ---- *Admonendos esse censuit, confidens, eos*, &c. ---- *Propterea quae admonet Imperatorem*, &c. ---- But so it is, that, had they prosecuted the former 13. *Articles* that were drawn up, such thing seems not deprived of a plausible excuse; for that there was nothing proposed in them, but what was formerly contained in the *Imperial* Laws, as Cardinal *Morone*, the *Pope's* Legat in the Council, assured the *Emperour* (See *Pall. l.* 23. *c.* 4. *n.* 6.) and as is expressed in the Preface to those Articles (See *Soave*, p. 769.) and, for that they only admonished supreme Princes to cause their *inferiour* Magistrates (against whom was their chief complaint, for their infringing the *Church's* Immunities †) to observe the former grants of the Secular Powers, made to the *Church*; which Grants some conceive, after a *free donation* of them, cannot be at pleasure resumed; especially when confirmed to the Church, many of them, by a decurrent practice from the times of the first Christian *Emperours*. What passages, in the Council, especially in the two *last Sessions*, as infringing the *rights* of *Princes*, were excepted against by the King, or Parliaments of *France*, you may see (for it would be too tedious to recount them here) in *Soave* p. 819. and you may see the defences, in behalf of the Council, returned to them by *Palavacin* in *l.* 24. *c.* 10. and, concerning Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction in temporal matters, *l.* 12. *c.* 3. As for that particular, urged by *Soave* and others,

Soave. p. 760.

† *Pallav. l.* 22. *c.* 6. *n.* 1.

thers, of the Council's depriving those *Princes* of their States, who shall allow Duels; That clause in it [*Quod ab Ecclesiâ obtinent*] ---- *Jurisdictione, & Dominio civitatis, castri, aut loci, in quo, vel apud quem, duellum fieri permiserint quod ab ecclesiâ obtinent, privati intelligantur*, shews this privation limited to those places, where the *Church* hath the *Temporal* Dominion. But, mean-while, where-ever is supposed either a publick concurrence, and consent of the secular powers to such an Act of the Church, or a former grant made by them of such Priviledges, and Rights to the *Church*, here such Act of the Church cannot be justly censured, and (to use *Spalatensis* † his words concerning the third *Capitulation* in the *Lateran* Council under *Innocent* 3. which is also much agitated) ---- *Legitimum erit, si supremorum Principum concessione tacitâ, vel expressâ, editum fuerit.* Lastly, since many of those Regal rights, mentioned in *Soave*, and pretended to be violated by the Council, were not *peculiar* to *France*, but *common* to it with all other *Princes*, it is most probable; that, had the Council been faulty therein, other Princes would have resented such wrongs, and remonstrated against them, as well as *France*; For they did so against those 13. *Articles*, which were afterward laid aside; but yet, nor they, nor their Embassadors (vigilant, and exceptious, enough in other matters) who then attended the Council, and unanimously assented to these Acts, discerned in them any such violation; and we may much rather conclude them *just*, because the *Emperour*, *King* of *Spain*, and many other *Princes*, accepted them; than *unjust*, because one *King*, or *State*, refused them; And, from finding the causes of the *French* State rejecting the Council so slight, perhaps it was, that *Henry* 4. at his reconcilement, promised with an oath to Pope *Clement* 8. to use all his endeavour, that this *Council* might be in his Kingdom entirely received ‖: and Cardinal *D' Ossat*, his great Councellor, and manager of his affairs at *Rome*, often writ in behalf of the Council, both to Secretary *Villeroi*, and to the *King* himself. ---- *That he found nothing in the Council opposit to the King's Authority.* ---- *Many things beneficial, none contrary to the* Gallican *Church; unless some one perhaps may think* Simonies, *and other abuses, and faults, to be priviledges of the Church* Gallican.---*That it displeased the great ones in* France, *because thereby they were not permitted to enjoy Benefices, incompatible, and with such other abuses, as were prohibited by the Council.* See his Letters to *Villeroi*, Feb. 15. 1597. --- And --- *Mar.* 31. 1599. --- Aud --- *May* 16. 1600 quoted in *Pall. l.* 24. *c.* 10. To which I may add what *Caterina de Medicis*, Q. *Regent* of *France* had urged before this, to the Pope's Nuncio, † --- *That the Council could not be admitted; because by the Council's decrees, the King could not thereafter gratifie such Ministers of State, as had done him singular service with the means of* Religious *Houses, or other Benefices of the* Church, *holden in Commendam.*

‖ Sess. 25. *c.* 18. *de Reform.*

† De Repub. Eccles. *l.* 6. *c.* 10. *n.* 102.

‖ Spondan. A. D. 1595. *n.* 9. Pallavic. 24. 11. *c.* 10. *n.* 15.

† Pallavic. 16. *c.* 11. *n.* 2, 4.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

6. *That the* Generality *of this* Council *is not prejudiced, by its being called by the* Pope. §. 80.
7. *Nor by reason of,*
   1. *The pretended Non-generality of the Summons,* §. 82.
   2. *Or, Non-freedom of the Place.* §. 83.
   3. *Or, the want of Safe-conduct.* §. 92. *Where,*

Concerning the Doctrine imputed to the Roman-*Church,* That Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks, §. 93. *And of the practice of the Council of* Constance. §. 101.

§. 80. 6. 6ly. THis said (from, §. 66) That there is no prejudice done this *Council*, for its bearing the Title of *General*, and its obliging as such, from the absence of Bishops, *Oriental*, or *Occidental*, *Protestant* or *Catholick*; or also from the very *small numbers* of the Bishops present in some *Sessions*; considering so plenary a *post-acceptation* of it, as hath been shewed:

Next; Neither seems this any just exception against it, that it was *called* by an Ecclesiastical Person, the *Prime Patriarch*, the *Bishop* of *Rome*. In defence of which perhaps that may suffice, that is said before at large. §. 47. *&c.* But here it is to be added: That this Council was called by him, after, First, having had the *consent* (both as to the place, and time) of the *Emperour*, and all the other *Christian Princes*, except those, that were *Protestants*, and *Henry* the Eighth; who, being a much minor part of these *Princes*, were either to be concluded by the contrary vote of the rest; or I see not, since that *Christianity* is divided amongst so many Soveraign, and Independent, States; and no *Heresie*, or *Schisme*, can be so molestful to the *Church*, as to need the Remedy of a *General Council*, save such, as first finds patronage from some Christian Prince, I say, I see not, how any such Council can ever be lawfully convened; because, if every such *Prince* be allowed a *negative* voice herein against the rest, there will never be wanting some *Prince*, or other, *extravagant* in matters of *Religion*, (as *Henry* 8th was, then, obnoxious for his new assumed Title of *Supreme* in *Spirituals*; and the *Protestant* Princes, for many other Innovations); and so such Prince also averse from the meeting of such a Council, wherein he foresees, that his party will be much the weaker, and over-voted.

§. 81. *Called*, then, this *Council* was by the *Pope*, but not without the consent of the *Emperour*, and the most of *Christian* Princes; nay, (if we may believe *Soave*) not without their great *solicitation* and *importunity*, necessitating him to call it, against his own inclinations; as if he much dreaded some effect thereof prejudicial to his present greatness. Especially, for the latter part of it, held under *Pius*, and confirming all the rest that had passed before, *Soave* saith †

faith † — *That the Actions of this Council were then in a greater expectation than in the former times, in regard all Princes had agreed in demanding it, and sent Embassadours to it; and also, that the number of Prelates then assembled were four times as many as before.* Called also by him it was; but after the *Protestant* Princes had declared a great necessity thereof; and after that both *Luther* himself, and his followers, had often, from the justice of the *present* Church-Governours, appealed to it. † All which considered, and supposing that all other things stand right; That neither the *necessity* of such a Convention at this time can be denied; nor the *place*, we weighing a general convenience, justly excepted against: Nor, that any persons are called to this Council, save *such*, and also all *such* called to it, as have been the usual constitutive Members of all other former allowed *General Councils*: nor any new *rule*, or way, proposed to be observed in this Council, but that which hath been formerly from the very beginning of the first *General* Councils (which proposal made to the *Protestants* by the *Pope*, then calling it, see in *Pallavic.* l. 3. c. 13. —— and in *Soave* p. 65.): Nor the *Pope*, or the Bishops constituting it, become any other way *a party* in this, than they have been formerly, in them; nor the lawful, and Canonical *freedom* of its Members appear any one abbridged by any precedent Oath, or Engagements made to the *Pope*, or others; nor the want of a *safe conduct*, and freedom of access, and recess, can be justly complained of; I say, all these offences voided, and these circumstances abstracted from, I suppose, the simple allegation of this *Council* its being *called* by the *Pope* will not be thought by *Protestants* the just subject of any quarrel; and therefore leaving this spoken-of before † I proceed to the considering of the other particulars, so many of them as shall need any Discussion.

† l. 6 p. 539.

† Soave, p. 8, 12.

† §. 47. &c.

7. Next, then, as this Council is not hence to be esteemed as any way defective, from its being called by the *Pope*; especially, when this done with the concurring consent of the *much-major part* of *Christian Princes*; So neither are any of these, The *non-generality* of the *Summons*; or the *non-freedome* of the *Place*; or the want of *safe-conduct*; justly pretended, for the condemning of this Council as illegal, and non-obliging.

§. 82. 7.

For first, 1. *For the summons and invitation*, see in *Soave* p. 101. how *universal* it was in *Paul* the Third's time, who began the Council; and again, how *punctual* it was in *Pius* the Fourth's time, who renewed the Council; In his sending several *Nuncios* (inviting them to it) to all *Protestant* Princes, and States, and, amongst the rest, to *Elizabeth*, the Queen of *England*, which made Bp. *Bramh.* (Reply. to *Chalc.* p. 352.) say --- *As we have in horrour the treacherous, and tyrannical, proceedings of* Paul *the Third* --- *So we acknowledge, with gratitude, the civilities of* Pius *the Fourth*; In his sending also an invitation to the *Greek* Church under the Christian *Emperour* of *Moscovy*; and *Baptista Romanus* a *Jesuite* to the *Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, to invite him to the Council † (which *Jesuit* brought from thence the *Arabian* copy of the *Nicene*

Ad 1.

† See the Preface to the Acts Concil. Nican.

†p. 481. *cene* Canons, in number 80.) and *Soave* acknowledgeth, † that some deliberation there was of sending, and granting a safe-conduct, unto the *Greek* Churches under the *Turk*. --- *But it was presently seen (saith he) that these poor men, afflicted in servitude, could not, without danger, and assistance of many think of Councils.*

See the particular persons sent to all these Princes, and the success of their Embassies, in *Soave*, *l.* 5. *p.* 435, 439, 440. Where also he saith, that --- *Although the Pope was put in mind, that to send Nuncii into* England, *and to Princes elsewhere, who do profess open separation from the* See *of* Rome, *would be a disreputation to him; yet he answered, that he would humble himself to Heresie, in regard that whatsoever was done to gain souls to Christ did become that* See. *For the same reason also* [saith he] *he sent* Canobius *into* Polonia, *with design to make him to go into* Moscovy, *to invite that Prince and Nation to the Council, though they have never acknowledged the Pope of* Rome. Now here note one thing, which I shall have reason to apply to many other particulars, and shall often remember you of, That, if the Acts of *Pius* the Fourth, if the proceedings of that Council in his time, be justifiable, though those of, and under, *Paul*, and *Julius*, should be proved some way faulty, the number of Prelates insufficient, their decisions factiously carried, *&c.* yet this *Tridentine* Council will stand universally in force, as to all the decrees thereof; because this Council under *Pius* reviewed, and ratified, and made their act, all the Decrees made before (with what supposed defect or culpableness of their proceedings you please; for that may be right, that is not done rightly), under *Paul*, and *Julius*. So that who so justifieth this Council, save only for *Pius* his times, doth somwhat more than what is necessary.

§. 83. 2. 1. 2ly. *For the Place*, I desire these things may be considered.

1st. That no *Place* can be chosen any where so absolutely free, but that he, under whose temporal Dominion it is, may infer some violence to the Council, or to some party therein, with whom he is offended; and so, whereas the *Church* and the *Pope*, as well as Temporal *Princes*, have their *rights* and priviledges which may be violated, the place of the Council, in any *Secular State*, may seem not free enough for the *Pope*, and the *Church*; and again, since the Secular Princes have often differences, and several interests (as it happened frequently in the time of the Council of *Trent*) the place of the Council in one's Dominions will not seem free enough to another. Unless it may be thought a sufficient remedy for such (unavoidable) inconvenience, that, when such violence appears, the Council may cease acting, or be suspended, or dissolved; or injured States withdraw from it their Bishops.

§. 84. 2. 2ly. That the place of former Councils, appointed at *Rome*, or in some other City in *Italy* (as it was in the *Roman*, *Lateran*, *Florentine*, *Pisan*, Councils) was not accounted therefore to render them not free, because of the nearer influence from the *Pope*, though in all those Councils, there was something to be decided, wherein the *Pope's* judgment stood not in *æquilibrio*, but

was

was inclined more to one ſide, than another; and wherein one ſide might pretend him a *Party*; as in the controverſies of the *Waldenſes*, of *Berengarius*, of the *Grecians*, &c.

§. 85. 3. 2ly. That the *Emperour* took ſufficient care, that this Council ſhould not be convened in any place of *Italy*, which was under the Temporal Dominion of the *Pope*: or, where himſelf had not the chief command. He conſented indeed, that the Council ſhould be kept in *Mantua*; but ſee what he declared firſt to the *Proteſtants* concerning this place (in *Soave l.* 1. *p.* 80).--- *That the Duke thereof was Vaſſal to the Empire, ſo that the* Pope *had no power there; and that, if they deſired any further caution, himſelf was ready to give it them.* To which they anſwered; how rationally, I leave it to you: --- *That no ſafe-conduct could there free them from danger, for the* Pope *having adherents throughout all* Italy, *who bitterly hated them, there was great danger of treachery, and ſecret plots.* † And, as little reaſon, as theſe, had *Henry* the Eight, to proteſt againſt the Council at *Mantua* for fear of the Pope. † See *Soave*, *p.* 77.

§. 86. 4. 4ly. That the Pope had indeed no reaſon to allow the Council to be kept in any City of *Germany*, that was near the *Proteſtants*; not, to avoid their pleas, but, * for fear of their Arms (of which fear whether he had any juſt cauſe, we ſhall ſee more by and by): as likewiſe, * for the too great diſtance from *Rome*, whereby he could not ſo eaſily, from time to time, give directions to his *Legats* in thoſe many controverſies, which were likely to be agitated in that Council; and, in all which, it was impoſſible for him to give them a precedent information, with a ſufficient foreſight.

§. 87. 5. 5ly. That this Council was * celebrated in a place, to which the *Emperour* and the major part of *Chriſtian Princes*, namely all the *Catholick*, gave their conſent, and ſent (ſome ſooner, ſome later) their Biſhops and Embaſſadours too, which was enough to legitimate it, though perhaps they would rather have choſen another; and not all, the ſame.

[See *Soave p.* 101 -- and *p.* 702. Where, the King of *France* deſiring a tranſlation of the Council from *Trent* to *Conſtance*, *Wormes*, &c, for the more convenience of the *Dutch*, *Engliſh*, and part of the *French*, Prelates, *Soave* reports the King of *Spain* returning this anſwer: ---- *That the Council was aſſembled in* Trent *with all the ſolemnities, with* conſent of all *Kings*, *Princes*, *and at the inſtance of* Francis *the French King*; *that the* Emperour *had ſuperiority in that City, as in the others, that were named, and might give full ſecurity to all, in caſe the former ſafe-conduct were not ſufficient.*]

§. 88. Again, * celebrated in a place confining on *Germany*; and nearer to the *Proteſtants* there, than it was to the *Catholicks* of *France* or *Spain*; and of which the *Emperour* was the chief Lord.

§. 89. Therefore *Soave* (p. 309.) repreſents the *Emperour* diſcourſing thus to the *Proteſtants* concerning this City: --- *That they ſhould leave all to his care, who knew how to handle the buſineſs; that they ſhould ſuffer other Nations to meet, and that himſelf would go in perſon, if not thither, yet to ſome near place, and would take order, not by words, but deeds, that all ſhould paſs with good terms. And* (below) *that he, as Advocate to the holy Church, and Defender of the Councils, will do what belongeth to his charge, as he hath promiſed.* And (*p.* 669.) re-

lates --- *How the Cardinal of* Lorraine *sent a Gentleman to the* Emperour *to desire him, that he would not remove further from the Council in regard of the fruit which they hoped for by means of his vicinity, which will keep every one in his duty, and hinder the attempts of those, who would translate it into another place*, &c. And (*p.* 301.) relates the Pope's fears: --- *That he could not take all suspicion from the King of* France, *if the Council should be celebrated in* [Trent,] *a place subject to the* Emperour, *and near unto his Army.*

Again, a place it was, * not accessible by the *Pope's Forces*, unless marching first through another's Dominions, and trespassing on the *Emperour*, who was in *Italy* it self a Prince much more powerful than he; and, * a place, which either the *Emperour's* or *Protestant's* Forces might at any time surprize with a much shorter march. And therefore was not the *Pope* free from fears, concerning it (though he had more of *Germany*) as may be seen in *Soave*, *l.* 5. *p.* 436. where he saith: --- *That the* Pope *was troubled, because the* Protestants *of* Germany, *unto whom a great part of* France *was united, would demand exorbitant things which he could not grant them, --- and doubted they might be able to disturb the Council with Arms: --- that He confessed, that the dangers were great, and the remedies small, and was perplexed and troubled in mind.* Thus *Soave.*

§. 90. Nor were his fears groundless, as you may see, if you please to view (in *Pallavic. Hist. l.* 8. *c.* 5. and in *Soave* p. 203.) what fright the *Council* was put in, A. D. 1546. under *Paul*, 3. by the *Protestant* army, having taken *Chiusa*, and drawing near to *Tirol*; and again yet more, A. D. 1552. under *Julius* the Third. The more particular relation of which, though mentioned before, is worthy your knowledge.

† See Spondan. A. D. 1562. — *Soave*, p. 374. &c. — *Pallavicin. l.* 13. *c.* 3.

† At this time several Embassadors from *Protestant Princes* came to *Trent*, desiring a *safe-conduct* for their *Divines*; being very serious in this business, as the Council supposed, who suspected nothing of a War intended: of which *safe-conducts*, one, and a second drawn up (how full and punctual I desire you but to peruse it, as set down in *Soave*, *p.* 370. or in *Conc. Trid.* Sess. 15.) yet pleased them not, because not containing also in it those *conditions* which they required to be observed in treating their controversies, one of which conditions was, *that the holy Scriptures only should be judge.* Yet upon this Conduct, about the middle of *March*, came some Protestant Divines to *Trent*: four from *Wirtemberg*, and two from *Argentina*, who exhibited a Confession of their Faith, and then earnestly desired a conference with the Divines of the Council about those controversies; which conference was, for a little while, delayed, by reason of the sickness of the Pope's Legate, (of which sickness he died within a few weeks) and, for that the Council had not as yet determined the manner, and form, of their treating with them. Now, this being the only *appearance*, that ever the Protestants made in the Council; *By this* (saith *Soave*, p. 362.) *both the Emperour, and the Electors, were assured, that* Maurice *the Duke of* Saxony, *though there were great levies made of Souldiers, did not attempt any thing of war.* But, whilst this was acting at *Trent*, the Protestant Princes, having secretly made a League with the French King, were preparing a sudden invasion upon the Emperour secure, and suspecting

suspecting nothing; and, when the time came to play their mine, ---- *The Saxon Embassadors* (saith *Soave*, p. 374.) *went secretly out of* Trent, *and returned home divers waies*; but, when their Divines departed, he mentions not.

The Protestant's arms prosper, the surprized Emperour being able to make little, or no, resistance; they take *Ausburg*; and afterward *Ispruck*, some three days journy from *Trent*, the Emperour with his Court flying out of it at mid-night in great confusion; and thus, the danger drawing so nigh *Trent*, the Bishops fly away, and the Council is dissolved the 28. of *April*, not daring to stay till the appointed time of the Session, the first of *May*; and the sick Legat carried thence to *Verona*, where, within three days, he died.

Now, from the coming of the *Protestant Divines*, which was about the middle of *March*, till the Protestant's appearing in arms, and besieging *Ausburg*, which was on the first of *April*, and so putting the Council in a fright, was not above *a fortnight*; and yet see what a complaint *Soave* (p. 375.) makes, ---- *How these Protestant Divines were delayed from time to time, not admitted to dispute, not to be heard, glad to divulge printed copies of their* Confession, *because the Legate concealed it.* By this you may see, how *unfree* this place was to the *Protestants*, and how *secure* for the *Catholicks*, by vertue of the *Pope's* great power there. See again in *Soave*, p. 779. the fears of the Council. A. D. 1563. upon the *Emperour's* being sick; as from whom they had their Protection, and whose safe-conduct expired with his life.

6. Lastly: The *Council's* opposing the *Pope* so constantly, in some (though not *Protestant*) points; and their great unanimity in their condemning most of the *Protestant* tenents, shew the place sufficiently free; for, where there is compulsion used, there would appear some reluctance. §. 91. 6.

3ly. For the *Safe-conduct*. It was granted, when desired, to the *Protestants*, for the security of their persons, as full, as could be demanded. The clause put in the first Safe Conduct (which you may see in the Council, *Trid. Sess.* 13.) [*quamvis ad ipsam sanctam Synodum spectat*,] is excepted against, in *Soave*, † as if not involving the *Pope*; but, besides that the *Protestants* might have had the *Pope's* Safe-conduct if they pleased, but they omitted, and probably disdained, to ask any such thing: besides this, I say, this Safe-conduct was subscribed by his *Legate* in his stead; and what could the *Protestants* fear, when the *Pope* had there no secular Power, and when the Council, for any other spiritual power of his, should side with them (according to the obligation of the Safe-conduct) against him? But yet, to give content, this *clause*, in the two following Safe-conducts (which see in the Council of *Trent*, *Sess.* 15. under *Julius*, and again, *Sess.* 18. under *Pius*) was omitted. §. 92. 3. † p. 344.

But after all this, 1st. The doctrine, said to be common in the Church of *Rome*, that *fides non est servanda Hæreticis*; and 2ly. the practice of the Council of *Constance*, according to it, in their putting to death *John Husse*, are brought as arguments that there can be no security in *Safe-conducts*, how full §. 93.

soever

soever, for men once accounted *Hereticks*. Of which Council of *Constance* it is urged as a *Constitution* (in *Soave*, p. 368. and elsewhere (----*That faith, or Safe-conduct, given by the* Emperour, Kings *or others, to* Hereticks, *or persons suspected, ought not to be observed*: and, if the *Emperour's* not to be observed, we may also infer, not the *Council's*.

§. 94. But here first, The *doctrine* of those learned men in the Church of *Rome*, who have written of this subject, is much *wronged*, or *mistaken*. This question; *Whether faith given, be to be kept, to Hereticks*; as also, *Whether to Infidels, and Heathens, to Enemies, to Subjects in Rebellion*, (Princes at such time parting with their Rights) *&c*, being always stated by them *Affirmatively*; and Faith, maintained to be kept as much to any of these, as to *Catholicks* themselves: And, if this be the *publick Faith*; *i. e.* of the *Prince*, or supreme temporal *Magistrate*, this Faith is declared to be *jure Gentium*, unviolable, as without which no peace, nor society, could be maintained in the world; and by no person whatever, not the *Pope* himself, to be dispensible, or relaxable.

[*Defens. Haeret. servand. l. 3. c. 10.* [*Nullum scio Theologum*, (saith *Molanus* sometime Divinity-Professor at *Lovain*) *neque etiam clari nominis Jurisconsultum, quin conformiter doceant, fidem publicam Haretico servandam esse. Fateor quidem, esse aliquo numero Jurisconsultos, qui doceant, Fidem privatam haretico servandam non esse, quia hostis est publicus.* [But this is upon supposing the *law* of a *Superiour*, prohibiting to private men the engagement of any such faith to such publick Enemies, being a thing *contra publicum bonum*, or, *contra salutem animarum*, declared by such Superiours. Else, the *publick faith* (suppose, of a *General Council*, *cedentis de suo jure*, and engaging exemption, and impunity, to some Heretick in a matter belonging to its Jurisdiction) or also *private Faith*, where is not such prohibition, once given to a publick Enemy, are affirmed to remain, afterward, inviolable]. *P. Layman* Theol. Moral. l. 2. tract. 3. c. 12. ---- *Fœdera publica Gentium jure introducta sunt: --- Idq; propter necessitatem. --- Quia nisi fœdera publica, seu inter diversos principes, aut respublicas, seu inter Principem, & subditos ejus*, v. g. *rebellantes* [to whom he adds *Hereticks* upon the same ground, §. *Dico* 40. --- *Nec hoc ita magnum* (saith he) *videri debet, sperantibus in Deo & Christo summo Ecclesiæ defensore, qui auxilium fert in tempore opportuno*] *inita, omnimodè servanda essent, nulla pax, aut societas, inter humanum Genus consistere posset.* And more particularly concerning *Hereticks* thus *Becanus* de fide Hæret. servand. c. 12. --- *Quæstio est; an, quando Catholicus Princeps, sive sæcularis sit, sive Ecclesiasticus, concedit Hæreticis salvum conductum liberè veniendi, & redeundi, (sive id faciat jure communi, sive speciali* (i. e. this latter way) *debeat illis servare fidem, necne? Affirmant* (saith he) *uno consensu omnes Catholici.* [where he instanceth also in the practice of the Emperour, *Charles* the fifth, to *Luther*; and goes on]. *Hic valdè miror adversarios, qui etsi hæc audiant à nobis, tamen clamant; nos contrarium docere.* But see the same professed jointly by the Council of *Basil*, and the *Emperour*, in their *Safe-conduct* to the *Bohemians*, securing them not only from the hand of *violence*, but also, of *justice*; whose words, in the close of it, are these. --- *Promittimus sine fraude, & quolibet dolo, quod nolumus, neque debemus, quacunque*

occa-sione

occasione pretensâ, uti authoritate, vel potentiâ, jure, statuto, vel privilegio legum, vel Canonum, & quorumcunque Conciliorum specialiter Constantiensis, & Senensis, quâcunque formâ verborum expressâ, in aliquod præjudicium salvo Conductui per nos concesso. [What more clear than this for the lawfulneſs, and undiſpenſableneſs, of ſuch publick faith, though given in the largeſt form, and moſt derogatory to the Engager's rights?]

§ 95. Only, ſome *Caſes* there are, wherein (all judicious *Proteſtants*, I ſuppoſe, conſenting) *Faith* given may not be kept to *any* perſon whatſoever; and ſo neither to *Hereticks*; ſuch as theſe. 1ſt. If the *faith* be given not abſolutely, but *conditionally*, the Condition wanting, or failing, the faith, or promiſe, given with, and limited by, it, is voided. 2. So alſo, if the matter of the faith, oath, or promiſe, be a thing *unlawful* to be done; neither, here, may ſuch faith either lawfully be given; or, given, be obſerved. If the *matter be unlawful*, I ſay; either by the *Divine* law, if, and though, it be the publick faith given by a *ſupreme* Authority: or alſo, by any *humane* law, if it be a faith given by *Inferiors*, and *Subjects* to ſuch laws. Among which unlawful things, and that *jure divino*, is to be numbred, if Faith be given, either by Prince or Subject, in any thing, which invades another's right, or aſſumes to our ſelves, what only is in another's lawful diſpoſal; and ſo involves doing wrong to a third perſon, which it is never lawful to do; (though *cedere de noſtro jure* is a thing very lawful). So, for Example, in the particular matter of *Hereticks*. If the *ſupreme* Temporal Magiſtrate ſhould paſs his *faith* to one ſuſpected of Hereſie, to free him from any *Trial* thereof by the *Eccleſiaſtical* Tribunal, or to free him, found guilty thereof, from the ſentence of *Excommunication*, a right belonging to the *Church*, and independent on ſecular Powers; or to introduce, or continue, him, excommunicated, in the *Catholick* Church-Aſſemblies, ſuch faith, as it is unlawfully given, ſo neither, given, can it lawfully be obſerved. Again, when the law of a Prince, or State, reſtrains to *profeſſed Hereticks* the publick Exerciſe of their Religion, or impoſeth ſome mulct upon them, and this law is here ſuppoſed juſt, if a *Subordinate* Officer, or *private* perſon, engage his faith to ſome Hereticks to the contrary, ſuch faith to them is not to be kept, as promiſing a thing not in his, but rather another's, lawful power, and diſpoſal; And the ſame it were in a private man's faith given to conceal an *Heretick*, or a *Robber*, or the like, where the law of the State obligeth all perſons to detect them.

Meanwhile, where none of the forenamed caſes happen; where the matter of the pact is no *ſin*, (and no ſin it is, that offends againſt no law) nor only *conditional*, Faith given to whomſoever, by what perſon ſoever, is affirmed no way diſpenſable, or remittible, (unleſs the party, to whom it is given, relaxe it) neither upon the plea of *Fear* in making it, (I ſay, no ſuperior law voiding ſuch pacts) nor upon any *dammage*, *temporal*, or *ſpiritual*, coming by it. For, ſome ſpiritual dammage to be ſuſtained thereby, affords no ſufficient ground to pretend an action unlawful. Since the *dammage*, both ſpiritual, and temporal, to the world would be far the greater, when none, by reaſon of theſe, and the like *Exceptions*, could have any ſecurity of another's faith:

faith: since such Pacts, and Oaths, most what, are made, from some temporal necessity constraining men thereto, and frequently do infer some spiritual, or temporal, dammage; or do some otherwayes hinder some publick, or private good.

§. 96. [To this purpose; *Melanus* saith, ‖ concerning the *publick faith*, when given to another, where the matter of it is not unlawful; That it is undispensable, or unrelaxable, by *any*, even the *Pope* himself; arguing thus, from the ill Consequences thereof. — *Si Romanus Pontifex, semel, in fidei publicæ transgressione dispenseret, hac non ferret legitima dispensatio, sed potius dissipatio; quia deinceps nemo posset securus esse, habita à rege, aut alterius Tituli Principe, salvo Conductu, solenni juramento, eò quod semper periculum sonet, ne Regia Potestas id, viâ dispensationis* [*à Pontifice*] *extorqueat, quod semel concessum esse novit.* Where he ungeth, * *Heb.* 6. 16. — [*Omnis Controversia eorum finis, ad confirmationem, est juramentum*]: and † *Soto*; who saith ‖, — *Pontificem non posse relaxare juramentum cum præjudicio ejus, cujus interest.* And thus *Layman* on the same subject †: *Si à Christiano*, v. g. *Rege cum* Infidelibus [and the same he repeateth afterward, *cum* Hereticis; and, before, *cum* Subditis Rebellanbus] *publicum fœdus fiat, nullâ unquam ratione, seu directè, seu indirectè, Summus Pontifex relaxare potest. Ratio est; Quia cederet in maximum detrimentum, ac contemptum ipsiusmet etiam Ecclesiæ. — Quamobrem, si quando fœdus, à Catholico Rege cum Infidelibus legitimâ potestate constitutum, cedere postea videatur in Ecclesiæ Catholicæ detrimentum, à Christo supremo ejus Rectore, & Defensore, auxilium sperandum. — Neque verò* (saith he) *tergiversationis locus est; * quod pars altera, ad fœdus ineundum, per vim injustam adacta sit, cum paciscentes superiorem Judicem non habeant, qui, causâ cognitâ, ipsis jus dicat.* Nor — * *Quod fœdus, publicâ authoritate initum, Principi, aut Reipublicæ paciscenti, perniciosum esse appareat.* Nor — * *Quodcunque incommodum, seu detrimentum Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, ex fœderis observatione, inferendum*; and his reason is, because, if such prejudices to Church, or State, be once admitted as just causes for voiding the publick Faith, —— *Nulla pax, aut Societas, inter humanum Genus consistere possit.* This, concerning the *publick Faith* given to Infidels, Hereticks, Rebels, or others, in matters, where no common Superior is acknowledged to have Right of disposing them otherwise.]

‖ *l.* 3. c. 14.

‖ *De Jure l.* 8. *q.* 1. *c.* 9.

† *l.* 2. *Tract.* 3. *c.* 12.

§. 97. But, as to *private Contracts, Faith*, or *Oaths*, where there is a common Superior to both parties, who may restrain, or moderate these upon all occasions according to the publick and private good, here several Laws and Constitutions, and common Customs, grounded on a moral equity, and necessity, to give him a power, in several cases which may happen, [such as these: Where such Contract, or Oath, is extorted by some injury first done to the party; as, by force, fraud, fear; or, where such engagement made in some great perturbation, and transport of mind; or, where the contract, though in a matter lawful, yet brings some great, unexpected, and unforeseen, dammage, to the publick, or private good, Spiritual, or Civil; or also, is a hinderance of some considerable greater good of the Church, or State, which the Contractors ought to prefer before their private: when these are judged, not by the *party*, but by the Superior, to be such:] the laws, I say, do

do give Him power, in ſuch caſes, to relaxe ſuch *pacts*, or *Faith*: and to oblige the party, to whom they are made, being ſubject to him, and ſuch laws, to remit them: And the parties, in making any ſuch *pact*, may and ought to know this ſuperintendent power; or alſo, all ſuch Oaths and Contracts, when they are made, are ſuppoſed to include a tacite Exception of ſuch *caſes*, to be ſtated by the Arbitrement of ſuch *Superiors*. And indeed; what thing better can be contrived, within the limits of a ſetled Government, than, that ſuch engagements ſhould be tranſacted with ſuch a reſerve of capability of relaxation by the Superior, where, otherwiſe, either by the difficulty of the obſervance of them, the circumſtances being changed, they will probably be broken: or ſome great dammage by them, publick, or private, inferred? But, in the publick, or private, Faith, paſſed between perſons that are joined together in no ſuch *ſociety*, no ſuch thing can be admitted; but the matter of ſuch oath, or promiſe being *Jure Divino* lawful, and diminiſhing no third Perſon's legal Rights, all dammages whatever are to be ſuſtained in a ſtrict, and undiſpenſable obſervance thereof, ſo far as the party to whom ſuch engagement is made, ſhall exact it: And ſo, in ſome ſenſe, Faith is maintained, to be kept by *Catholicks* to Enemies, Hereticks, Infidels, *&c*, when not ſo, by one *Catholick* to another; becauſe the conſtitutions, or cuſtoms, of the Government Eccleſiaſtical, or Civil, under which *Catholicks* live, do not extend to theſe other Covenants; and the excuſe of *dammage*, *fear*, *force*, &c, hath here no place, or conſideration, where is to be had no common Umpire, and Judge of ſuch matters.

§. 98.

If it be ſaid here; That *Secular* Princes are made, by *Roman* Divines, *inferiour* and ſubordinate to the *Eccleſiaſtical* Supreme (the *Pope*, or *General* Council) and ſo, that the Sanctions, and laws of the Church, by what is ſaid before, §. 97. will void at pleaſure the *Oath and engagement of Princes* to whatever Confederate, in whatever matter, as this being *contrary* to the law of a Superior, whoſe Conſtitutions they are obliged to obſerve. It is anſwered, that the *Roman* Church owns no ſuch Doctrine; nor do the Eccleſiaſtical Governors claim any Supremacy, or Legiſlative power, ſave in *Spiritual* matters. Contrary to which, therefore, if any of the Church's Subjects, though a *Prince*, make any oath, or promiſe, ſuch Faith given is not to be kept, by vertue of the former, ſubjection of ſuch Perſon to the *Church's Laws*. But, as for any Oaths, or engagements of Princes in other matters *Secular*; or alſo, any uſe of the Secular Sword, whether in matters Temporal or Spiritual, the Church claims no ſuperiority herein. The Secular and Eccleſiaſtical Magiſtrate have their diſtinct and independent Rights and Juriſdictions, freely confeſſed, by Cardinal *Bellarmin*, to be, both held from *Chriſt*, and not from one another.—— *Ex Scripturis* (ſaith he) † *nihil habemus, niſi datus Pontifici claves regni cælorum: de clavibus Regni Terrarum nulla mentio fit, Traditio Apoſtolica nulla.—— Quando Rex fit Chriſtianus, non perdit Regnum Terrarum, quod jam obtinebat.*—— And, quoting a paſſage out of an Epiſtle of Pope *Nicolaus*, —— *Quicquid* (ſaith he) *Imperatores habent, dicit Nicolaus, à Chriſto eos habere. Peto igitur; vel poteſt ſummus Pontifex auferre à Regibus, & Imperatoribus hoc, tanquam ſummus ipſe Rex, & Imperator; aut non poteſt; ſi poteſt,*

† *De Rom. Pontif. l. 5. c. 2.*

ergo est major Christo; Si non potest, ergo non habet veræ potestatem Regiam. Neither is any such *Power in Temporals* absolutely necessary to the Church, in order to Spirituals, without the exercise of which power the Primitive Church, though most grievously oppressed by *Secular* States, yet enjoyed this Government in *Spirituals*, perfect and entire, as to all things essentially necessary thereto. Their proper and distinct Rights, then, both these Supremes have. And their oaths and engagements (passed in matters of their proper *right*) to what persons soever are denied generally, by *Catholick* Divines, to be *dissolvable* by one another.

§. 99. [Of this particular of keeping faith with *Hereticks*, in such matters, thus, *P. Layman* a learned Jesuite. † —— *Dico 4to* —— *Si Catholici cum Hæreticis publicum fœdus ineant, non potest per authoritatem Pontificiam solvi, aut relaxari*; where he quotes also *Molanus*, saying, † —— *Neque ullum hactenus extitit, aut unquam extabit hujus rei exemplum.* And thus *Becanus*, *de fid. Hæret. servand.* c. 7. —— *Virtutes illæ, ex quibus oritur obligatio servandæ fidei in promissis, æquè nos obligant, sive apud Catholicos, sive apud Hæreticos, versemur: Nusquam enim* licet *mentiri; nusquam jus alterius violare, nusquam injustitiam committere nunquam perjurum esse.* —— *Quando fideles paciscuntur cum Gentilibus, & Idololatris, debent illis servare fidem in rebus licitis & honestis; ergo etiam, quando paciscuntur cum Hæreticis.* An oath of *fidelity*, therefore, taken by a Subject to an *Heretical* Prince, to aid him against all invaders of, his Dominions, or other temporal Rights, to pay him such, and such taxes, for the preserving of *Justice*, and protecting of his Subjects from *violence*, and injuries, is, to be observed, and undispensable, without the Prince's consent, because the matter of it lawful: But an oath taken to serve him in fight, or to perform any other act, for the *ruine* of the *Christian*, or the *Catholick*, Religion, is not to be kept, because the matter of such oaths *contra jus Divinum*.]

† Theol. Moral. l. 2 Tract. 3. c. 12.

† *De fid Hæret. servand. l. 5. c. 14.*

§. 100. As for that arguing of a late *Protestant* Writer, † —— That it follows from this proposition maintained by *Catholicks*; [*viz.* That faith given to Hereticks, *contra jus Divinum*, is not to be kept]: that therefore faith given to *Hereticks* is in no case to be kept; because all *Heresie* is *contra jus Divinum*: his words are,--- Simanca *concludes, that faith given, against the Divine law, is not to be kept; and it is well known; that all Heresies are accounted so by you; and therefore in no case faith is to be kept with Hereticks*]. 1st. If he argue well; *Protestants* are to maintain his Conclusion, as well as *Catholicks*; for *Protestants* also grant the two premises. 2ly. The arguing is like this: that faith in no case is to be kept to a drunkard: because drunkenness is held, *contra jus Divinum*; and it is unsyllogistical, and very faulty: Because, though Heresie, or Drunkenness, be a thing *contra jus Divinum*, yet that thing, wherein faith is given to such Heretick, or Drunkard, may not be so. But, if faith were given to an Heretick, concerning his Heresie: As, to maintain it with him; to aid or assist him in it; such faith indeed were not to be kept, for the reason given; because *Heresie*, and all defence of it, are, *contra jus Divinum*: But further: suppose the faith given to an Heretick be for the *toleration* of his *Heresie*; neither do *Catholicks* hold this (due circumstances put) to

† *Stillingfl.* Rational Account. part 2. c. 3. p. 352. & 350.

be

be *contra jus Divinum*. For, even a *moral Evil* may be lawfully tolerated, when there is just fear of far more evil, and that moral too, by not tolerating it. For, supposing, the toleration of any false religion by a *Catholick* Prince, without inflicting due punishment upon the Professors thereof within his Dominions is not lawful, *jure divino*, yet is it so, only to those, in whose *absolute*, and *free* power it is, to prohibit such Religion; And then; whether this, *rebus sic stantibus*, be for such time, and place, in a Prince's *free* power, must be left wholly to his arbitrement, who doubtless is the supreme Judge of his own Secular strength. And whomsoever he cannot master, as to force, however legally his Subject, neither may he reckon him under his Government, as to coaction to his duty; in such a case then toleration of Heresie is not *contra jus Divinum*. And, there is the same ground of keeping faith with such, as there is, with a forreign Enemy; for the Common-weales-sake. Becan. Ib. c. 10.—— *Si Princeps Catholicus paciscatur cum Hæreticis de toleranda libertate religionis, quam sine majori detrimento impedire non potest, sine dubio fides servanda est.*

This said in General of the Doctrine of the *Roman-Divines* in this point, which was the first thing objected before, §. 93. Now to consider the 2d. the *decree*, and *fact*, in the *Council* of *Constance*. §. 101. ——

For its *Constitution*. Sess. 19. It is only this. —— *Præsens Sancta Synodus declarat, nullum fidei Catholicæ, vel jurisdictionis Ecclesiasticæ, præjudicium generari, vel impedimentum præstari posse, vel debere, ex quovis salvo conductu per Imperatorem* &c, *Hæreticis, vel de Hæresi diffamatis, concesso, quocunque vinculo se adstrinxerit, quo minus, dicto salvo conductu non obstante, liceat Judici competenti, & Ecclesiastico de hujusmodi personarum erroribus inquirere, & alias contra eos debite procedere, eosdemque punire, quantum justitia suadebit,* &c. [*i. e.* so far as their jurisdiction extends]. *Nec sic promittentem* [i. e. Imperatorem, *&c*], *cum fecerit, quod in ipso est* [*i. e.* quod jure facere potest], *ex hoc* [salvo conductu] *in aliquo remansisse obligatum*: [as to any further observance of his promises]. Which Constitution, in all the parts of it, must needs be justified, unless one man's *promise*, or *oath*, takes away another man's *Right*. But such a promise, as takes away another man's right, is unlawful, and therefore void; and he who thus engageth, very faulty in making it, but obliged to break it.

Again, for matter of *fact*; that the Council contained it self within the limits of the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, leaving, after this executed, *John Husse*, as to any further temporal punishment, to the justice of the Imperial laws, appears sufficiently in the conclusion of its *Sentence* against him, *Sess.* 15. ending thus. —— *Hæc Sancta Synodus Joannem Hus, attento, quod Ecclesia Dei non habeat ultra quid gerere valeat, judicio sæculari relinquere, & ipsum Curiæ sæculari relinquendum fore, decernit.* Thus much clear.

But next; It is not so easie to resolve punctually what was the form of the *Emperour's Safe-conduct*, granted to *Husse*; whether it run after the common manner, for securing his coming and returning, from any unjust violence, §. 102. ——

that might be offered; or yet further; for securing him also from execution of Secular Justice upon him, if found criminal, [for, this latter also, as to those punishments belonging to the Jurisdiction of the Civil Magistrate, is granted to be in his lawful power, and he obliged to keep his faith, made either of these ways]: I say, this is not so easie to resolve; nor what jealousie the *Emperour* might have at first, before he was better satisfied concerning their distinct Jurisdictions, lest the Council's proceedings upon the trial of *Huß* for Heresie might some way infringe his Safe-conduct. Now, for any evidence in these things: 1st. The *Safe-conduct* it self is no where extant. 2ly. *Molanus*, with many other *Catholick* Writers, with great probability, contend; that this *Safe-conduct* was drawn only in the common form of such Writs, and to be understood in their ordinary sense; namely, to secure such person from any violence, that shall be offered towards him, but not from justice; for which the aforenamed Author ‖ quotes *Mynsinger*, *Obs.* 82. —— *Quando datur alicui securitas, vel salvus conductus* [*i. e.* in the common form] *tunc intelligitur solùm de volentiâ, quæ de facto contra jus infertur*; and produceth an usual form of the Emperour's; —— *Damus tibi fidem publicam, causam dicendi in Judicio contra vim, non tamen contra juris Executionem.* And this is rendred much the more creditable, in that we find a *Safe-conduct* in this very sense granted by this Council of *Constance*. *Sess.* 6. to *Hierom* of *Prague*, (for *Huß* defired none from the Council) upon which he also thought fit to venture himself, and appear before it. The form thereof is this: —— *Citamus*, &c, *quatenus compareas*, &c, *recepturus in omnibus justitiæ complementum, ad quod à violentiâ (justitiâ semper salvâ) omnem salvum conductum nostrum, quantum in nobis est, & fides exigit orthodoxa, præsentium tenore offerimus.* Now, since *Hierom*, after *Huß* his having been some time at *Constance*, ventured to appear there upon such a Safe-conduct, why may we not reasonably imagine (notwithstanding the declarations of some *Protestants* of the extream folly of such an action) that *John. Huß* might have the same confidence, or commit the like over-sights, as the other; as, much mistaking at first both the strict justice of the Council, and the weakness of his cause. The same thing may be probably gathered from his flight, after some time, out of *Constance*, hidden in a Cart laden with goods; which argues the little confidence he had in the *Form* of his *Safe-conduct* to protect him from justice; as this also doth; that neither at his *trial* nor his *Death*, he is mentioned, in his follower's relating his story, either to have claimed the priviledge of such a Safe-conduct, or accused any of the breach thereof.

‖ l. 2. c. 3.

But now, suppose it a Safe-conduct, securing him not only from *violence*, but also from *execution of justice*; yet it is related to have been so conditioned, as that, if he should attempt any flight (which he did) he should forfeit all the benefit of it; and, thus free, Justice Ecclesiastical, and Civil, proceed against him. Now, that, by one of these ways, the *Emperour* was discharged from his faith given to him, may justly be presumed, in that, after his condemnation for Heresie, he made no scruple to put him to death; and that, before any Conciliar decree was passed by the Council in this matter, as it were to relaxe, or dissolve his former engagement; *Huß* his Execu-

tion

tion being in *July*; and the aforementioned decree paſſed in *September* following.

But, be theſe things how they will, of which ſeveral flouriſhes, and conjectures are made both wayes; And let us ſuppoſe, *the Safe-conduct* to free him totally from the Secular Juſtice; and ſome miſcarriages alſo to have been in the proceedings of the *Emperour*, or *Council*, (which is not impoſſible:) yet, not the leaſt errour can be found in the *Decree* or *Conſtitution* or Doctrine of the *Council*, which is ſo much blamed, as which expreſly declares; That the Prince, once his faith given, *debet facere, quod in ipſo eſt*, [i. e. *quod eſt in ipſius legitimâ poteſtate*]; and then: This alſo is granted (See *Becan. c.* 12. quoted before, §. 94.), That it is a thing in the *Prince's* lawful power, to ſuſpend the execution of his own laws; and, upon ſuch ſuppoſitions, if the *Emperour* through the importunities of ſome others did not this, I ſee not how he can be therein excuſed: But ſtill the *Council's* Decree hath no hand in ſuch guilt. But laſtly, The Delegates from *Bohemia*, who where *Huſſites*, their repairing, ſome ſixteen years after, to the Council of *Baſil*, upon the ſecurity of the *Council*, and the ſame *Emperor Sigiſmund's Safe-conduct*, ſhews ſufficiently that the *Safe-conducts* of *Huß*, and *Hierom* of *Prague*, were too narrow to ſhield them from *juſtice*, as well as from *injury*; and not ſuch faith of the *Emperour*, or *Council*, as was promiſed to them, to have been afterward *broken*: For, to the ſame *Faith*, only the form of the Safe-conduct changed, theſe Commiſſioners from *Bohemia* freely truſted themſelves. Thus much of the Council of *Conſtance*, in which, for that which is related here out of the Story, I muſt refer you to,--*Molanus de Fide Hæret, ſervand. l.* 3.---*Spondanus* and the Authors mentioned by him, in A. D. 1415. n. 44, and 45. eſpecially *Cochæus*, in his *Hiſtor. Huſſit. l.* 2. and 3. who takes his matter out of the Stories delivered by ſome of *Huß* his followers. §. 103.

But yet (to give all content) the *Council* of *Trent*, in their *Safe-conduct*, did expreſly, *huic conſtitutioni Conſtantienſi, in hâc parte, pro hâc vice, derogare.* §. 104.

The *Trent-Conduct* thus qualified for their ſatisfaction; yet another exception the *Proteſtants* had againſt it; That, whereas they chiefly deſired two things, [*viz.* 1. That the *Scripture alone* might be the *Judge* or Rule to try the *Controverſies* by; and, 2. That the *Proteſtants*, joined in an *equal* number with the *Catholicks*, might have deciſive votes; or, the Controverſies be decided by an equal number of Lay-Judges, choſen on both ſides] The form of this *Trent-ſafe-conduct*, for the *Proteſtants*, did not as to theſe *exactly* follow that of *Baſil*, for the *Bohemians*; whereby (had it been granted, ſaith *Soave* †) *the Proteſtants would have obtained one great point; that is, that the Controverſies ſhould be decided by the Holy Scripture*; and afterward, (*Soave*, p. 366.) It is pretended, *That ſuch* a Safe-conduct *would have given them a deciſive voice.* But, in anſwer to theſe: For this laſt point, there appears no ſuch thing in that conduct of *Baſil*: For the former point; the words of the *Safe-conduct* in *Concil. Baſil.* 4. *Seſſ.* are theſe: --- *In cauſâ quatuor Articulorum per eos attentorum Lex Divina, praxis Chriſti, Apoſtolica, & Eccleſiæ primitivæ, unà cum Conciliis, Doctoribus, fundantibus ſe veraciter in eâdem, pro veriſſimo, & indifferenti* † p. 344.

UMI

renti Judice, in hoc Basilienſi Concilio admittentur. Whereas the words of the Safe-conduct in the Council of *Trent* are theſe,---*S. Trident. Synodus concedit, quòd cauſæ controverſæ, ſecundùm ſacram Scripturam, & Apoſtolorum traditiones, probata Concilia, Catholicæ Eccleſiæ conſenſum, & Sanctorum Patrum authoritates, in prædicto Concilio Tridentino, tractentur.* Where we ſee, both the Conducts do agree in [*Praxis*, or *Traditio Apoſtolorum*] in [*Concilia*, and *Doctores*, or *Patres*]: only the latter omits the clauſe [*fundantes ſe veraciter in Scripturâ*]. The reaſon of which omiſſion, ſee in *Pallav. l.* 12. *c.* 15. *n.* 9. And it is clear at firſt ſight; becauſe this clauſe was capable (though contrary to the intention of the Council of *Baſil*) of ſuch a falſe Gloſſe, (namely, if it be thus underſtood; that, when any Authority was produced out of *Councils*, or *Fathers*, the *Proteſtants* might accept, or reject it, as they judged it to be founded, or not founded in the *Scriptures*) as would void the ſenſe of the words, that went before it, and make them needleſs yadded to [*Lex Divina*]; the *Proteſtants*, when any ſuch authority out of *Councils* or *Fathers* is urged, anſwering; *Oſtende, quòd illa Concilia*, &c, *ſe veraciter fundarunt in Scripturâ*: which is the ſame with; *Proba hoc quod Concilium dicit ex Scripturis.* For, ſuppoſe thoſe *Councils* quote ſome *Scriptures* for what they ſay, yet will not *Proteſtants* therefore yield, that what they ſhall ſay, is founded there; becauſe they may ſay, they quote them in a wrong ſenſe: and now you may ſee the reaſon of what *Soave* ſaid above, and the great point the *Proteſtants* had gained, if the Safe-conduct had run in the *Form* of *Baſil*, though that Form names, with the *Scriptures*, *Concilia*, *& Doctores*, *& praxin Apoſtolicam*, *& primitivæ Eccleſiæ*, for the Judge of Controverſies. But, why is the *Tridentine Council* ſo averſe, you will ſay, that *Scripture only* ſhould be the Judge, or the ground of their judgment in matters of Religion? For this reaſon; becauſe, when there is controverſie of the *meaning* of *Scripture*, (as moſtly it is) it is fit, the *Councils* and *Fathers* ſhould terminate the diſpute therein; or elſe what end can be of ſuch Controverſie, when thoſe, againſt whom the *Councils* declare, ſhall ſo often ſay, the *Councils* declare againſt the *Scriptures*, *i. e.* their ſenſe of them? But here it is ſufficient; that though the Safe-conduct, as to the way, which the *Proteſtants* demanded, of the trial of their Doctrines, was excepted againſt, (of which more by and by) yet, as to the ſecurity of their perſons, it was unqueſtioned. Thus much from §. 82. that no deficiency in the *Summons*, *Place*, or *Safe-conduct*, hath rendred this *Council* Illegal, or non-obliging.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

8. *That this Council is not rendered illegal, by the* Oath *of* Biſhops *taken to the* Pope. §. 105.

9. *Nor yet, by the* Biſhop's, *or* Pope's, *being a Party, and Judges in their own Cauſe.* §. 113.

1. *Not, by the Biſhops their being Judges,* Ib.

Where,

Of ſeveral other ways of judging Eccleſiaſtical Controverſies, juſtly rejected. §. 118.

2. *Nor, by the* Pope's *being Judge.* §. 122.

8ly. NEither doth the *Oath*, that was taken by the *Biſhops* to the *Pope*, hinder this *Council*, conſiſting of thoſe Biſhops, from being a *free*, *legal*, and *obliging* Council. The ſum of which *Oath* is, ---- *Ego N. Epiſcopus fidelis ero Sancto Petro, Sanctæ Apoſtolicæ Romanæ Eccleſiæ, Domino meo Papæ N. cjuſque Succeſſoribus Canonicè intrantibus.* ---- *Papatum Romanæ Eccleſiæ, & Regulas Sanctorum Patrum, adjutor ero ad defendendum, & retinendum contra omnem Hominem.* [Regulas Sanctorum Patrum; or *Regalia Sancti Petri*, as it is in latter *Pontificals*; which *Regalia*, I ſuppoſe relates to the *Pope's* temporal Dominions, and is more properly fitted to the Biſhops living in, or near them; as alſo *non ero in Conſilio, ut vitam perdat*, and ſeveral other Paſſages in the Oath, ſeem to be]. ---- *Jura, honores, privilegia, & authoritatem Romanæ Eccleſiæ, Domini noſtri Papæ, & ſucceſſorum prædictorum, conſervare, defendere, augere, & promovere, curabo. Nec ero in Conſilio, in facto, ſeu tractatu, in quibus contra Dominum noſtrum, vel Romanam Eccleſiam, aliqua ſiniſtra, ſive præjudicialia perſonarum, juris, honoris, ſtatus, & poteſtatis eorum, machinentur.* §. 105. 8.

1. Where note firſt. That it is the ordinary, and cuſtomary Oath taken by all Biſhops at their *Conſecration*; not an oath impoſed on them with any particular Relation to this Council; and that it is, for ſubſtance, the ſame oath, as hath been uſually ſworn in former ages, precedent to many other Councils, without being complained of, or conceived any way to abbridge their *Liberties*: Nor is it now a grievance, ſave to ſuch, as deny to this *Prime-Patriarch* his *ancient* and *Canonical* rights. §. 105. 1.

2ly. That ſome ſuch ſtipulation of *obedience* and *fidelity* to Eccleſiaſtical Superiors, is required by the *Reformed* themſelves: and every *Biſhop* in the Church of *England*, at his Conſecration, takes an oath to perform all due reverence and obedience to his *Archbiſhop*, and the *Metropolitan* Church, and their Succeſſors. And, though, in a thing, ſo far as it is granted lawful, it matters not, how new is the practice; yet ſuch an oath particularly to this *Prime-Patriarch*, eſpecially for the *Biſhops* ſubjected to his *Patriarchy*, hath been alſo anciently uſed. [See the order in *Conc. Tol.* 11. *can.* 10. --- *Omnes Pontifices,, Rectoreſque Eccleſiarum, tempore, quo ordinandi ſunt, ſub cautione* §. 107. 2.

tione promittant, ut fidem Catholicam custodiant--- atque obsequii reverentiam praeeminenti sibi dependant: [Where, why, *omnes Pontifices, praeeminenti sibi*, may not as lawfully be extended to the pre-eminency of the *Patriarch*, as of the *Metropolitan*, I see nothing to hinder]. And see *apud Baron.* A. D. 722. the form of the oath of *fidelity* to the *Pope* taken by *Winfrid* our Country-man, and other Bishops of those times, at their Ordination.---*Promitto Ego N. Episcopus tibi, B. Petre Apostolorum Princeps, vicarioque tuo B. Gregorio Papæ, & successori ejus--- me omnem fidem & puritatem Sanctæ fidei Catholicæ exhibere, & in unitate ejusdem fidei persistere.* Again, —— *Fidem, & puritatem meam atque concursum tibi, & utilitatibus Ecclesiæ tuæ,* [i. e. Petri] (*cui à Domino Deo potestas ligandi, solvendique data est*) *& prædicto vicario tuo, atque Successoribus ejus per omnia exhibere*, &c. And see muchwhat the like form in *Greg. Epist. l.* 10. *ep.* 31.--*Ego civitatis illius Episcopus, sub anathematis Obligatione, promitto sancto Petro Apostolorum Principi, atque ejus Vicario Beato Gregorio, vel successoribus ipsius,* —— *semper me in unitate sanctæ Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, & Communione Romani Pontificis, per omnia, permansurum. Unde jurans dico per Deum Omnipotentem, & hæc Sancta quatuor Evangelia*, &c.] Where, though the occasion of the Oath is a returning from Heresie, as one confines it, † yet the words, *promitto sancti Petri Apostolorum Principis Vicario, me in Communione Romani Pontificis, per omnia, permansurum* (in this; as also, *me fidem atque concursum tibi & utilitatibus Ecclesiæ tuæ per omnia exhibiturum*, in the precedent Form) include a fidelity, and subjection to St. *Peter's* Chair; and that the Bishops, in those ancient days, sware no less, to continue in the Communion of the Bishop of *Rome*, than in the unity of the Catholick Church; Indeed these two were then conceived inseparable; and therefore, in the same Form, it is called, *unitas sedis Apostolicæ*; and those, who desert it, are said to depart *à radice unitatis*. Now, this Oath being taken lawfully in such a case; why may it not be so, at any other time? And if this *Council* of *Trent*, by reason of such modern Oath taken by the Bishops to the *Pope*, may not be thought *Free* to proceed against any disorders in this *See*; neither may any of those Councils which have been celebrated since the use of the like Oaths, since that *Toletan Council*, since *Gregory's*, or *Winfrid's*, times, be thought so.

† See *Stillingfl.* p. 490.

§ 108. 3. 3ly. Such Oath only obligeth to *Canonical* Obedience; only, to yield such obedience to the Bishop of *Rome*, as the *Canons* of former Councils do require,--- *Donec Pontifex est; & dum jubet ea, quæ secundùm Deum, & sacros Canones jubere potest; sed non jurant, se non dicturos, quod sentiunt, in Concilio; vel se non deposituros eum, si hæreticum esse convincant*, as *Bellarmin* † answered long since to this scruple: only they swear to defend, and promote, all, not to be in any action, or plot against, any of, his *legal*, and *Canonical* (for this is always understood in oaths) Rights, Authority, Priviledges, *&c.* Now, what offence here, what restraint of any lawful liberty? For, an Oath taken in general to *all* the Canonical rights of the *Pope*, and not specifying any in *particular*, leaves the Bishops, and the Council, in perfect liberty to dispute, examine, and determine what are his Cononical, and rightful priviledges, what not; leaves them liberty, to question his Supremacy, so far as he seems to them

† *De Concil. l.* 1. *c.* 21.

them to claim any such in causes, or over persons; Ecclesiastical, not appearing by Divine right, or Church-Constitution, due unto him: and generally, in liberty, to question, as *Bellarmin* observes, his commanding, or practising, things they think unlawful. And indeed the *Bishops* in *Trent*, sworn to maintain all his *lawful*, yet did dispute some of his *pretended*, Rights, and Priviledges; and, after much debate, left them unstated. Nor did the *Pope*, or his Legates, though willing enough to have prevented such agitations, yet plead any obligation in the Episcopal *Oath*, against them. This *Oath* therefore, obliging only to the observation of the former Divine, and Church-Laws, concerning the *Papal* Dignities, can be no more prejudicial to the liberty of Councils, than the former Laws and Canons are prejudicial thereto.

4ly. Bishops, *not sworn*, yet still remain obliged to the observance of all such Canons; so that such Oath is not the addition of a *new*, but the confirmation of a *former* obligation, which, when our Superiors, for their greater security, call for, we cannot justly deny. §. 109. 4.

5ly. Yet neither do such obligation, nor such Oath, laid on Bishops, taken singly, restrain their liberty, when met in a Council; but that they, with the present *Pope's* consent, may then *alter*, and *change* those *Canons*, and so, their obligation to them: No more than a Prince's, or his Subject's swearing to the observance of the Civil laws of a Nation, hinders these, when met in *Parliament*, to abrogate any law, or enact the contrary; all Oaths to laws have this tacit limitation: *viz.* till those, who have the authority, shall think fit to repeal them. And, in the consecration of the *Reformed* Bishops in *England*, the Oath, imposed upon them, of obedience to the *Archbishop*, is conceived to be unprejudicial to the *liberty* of their *Synods*. §. 110. 5.

6ly. If in this Oath any thing was sworn that was unlawful, the Bishops, so soon as this unlawfulness appeared to them, from that moment, without any *dispensation*, were discharged from the observance thereof; as *Luther*, and *Bucer*, so soon as it seemed to them unlawful, thought themselves quitted from the same, or the like, *Oath*, formerly taken, when they first entred into a *Religious* Order; but, if nothing was sworn in it but what was lawful, why complain the *Reformed* of this *Oath*? §. 111. 6.

7ly. Did this Oath of the Bishops lay some restraint upon their liberty, it would be only in one point of the *Protestant* Controversies, that concerning the *Pope's Supremacy*, but would leave it *free* as to all, or most of the rest. Neither see I what influence their swearing to maintain the *Pope's* just *Priviledges* could have upon their votes, in the points of *Justification*, *Transubstantiation*, *Invocation of Saints*, and the like. For, if this be named one of his *priviledges*, that their decrees in these points are invalid, unless by him confirmed, yet there is no reason, that this should incline them at all to vote, in these, contrary to their own judgment. 1st. Because (omitting here the obligation they have to promote *Truth* upon whatever resistance) they have no cause to presume *his* Judgment in such points (especially after their Consultations) would be different from *their's*. Or, 2ly. Because, if they knew §. 112. 7.

it would differ, yet they understood also, that, without the *concurrence* of their *Judgments*, his likewise is rendred invalid, and not able to establish any thing, wherein they dissent: As in some affairs of this *Council* it so happened. This, for the *Oath*; to pass on to others.

§. 113. 9. 9ly. Whereas it is pretended; that the *Bishop* of *Rome*, who presided, and those *Bishops*, who sate in the Council, were a party and Judges in their own cause: As, for instance, the controversies that were to be decided being between these two parties, *Protestants* and *Roman-Catholicks*, that those of the Council were all *Roman-Catholicks*, and the *Protestants* not permitted to have with the rest any decisive vote: Again; the *Protestants* accusing the *Roman*, and other *Western*, Churches; of many *corruptions* both in their *doctrine*, and in their *discipline*, yet that this Council was made up of the Bishops of those Churches which were thus accused: Again; one controversie being against the superiority of the *Order* of *Bishops* to the *Presbytery*, that therefore in this the Bishops were clearly a party: Another controversie being against the *Pope's Supremacy*, and particularly against his authority of *Calling* and presiding in Councils, that therefore in this the *Pope* was a party: Besides, that his stiling the *Protestants hereticks* before the Council renders him in it no impartial, nor unprejudiced Judge in their cause: I say, neither do these pretences hinder this Council (supposing it composed of so many *Bishops* of the *Catholick Church*, as are necessary to the constitution of a *General* Council, or of so many *Bishops* of the *Western* Churches, as are necessary to the constitution of a *Patriarchal*) from being a lawful Judge in these controversies; and the Acts thereof, obligatory to all; nor hinder not the *Pope* from presiding therein.

1. Where, 1st. To consider the legality of the Synod, as it consists of such Bishops.

§. 114. 1. And, 1st. Here we find; that all *Heresies* and *Schismes* have had the same plea against the former Councils, as the *Reformed* against this of *Trent*: namely, that the *contrary* party, the accuser, or the accused, was their *Judge*. All the Christian Clergy was once divided into *Arians* and *Anti-Arians*, or *Nestorians*, and *Anti-Nestorians*; as, in the times of the Council of *Trent*, it was into the *Protestants* and *Roman-Catholicks*: and the *Arians* then accused the *Catholick* Bishops of their corruption of the *doctrine* of the *Trinity*, as the *Protestants* did now the *Roman-Catholicks* of several corruptions in doctrine, and discipline: Yet so it was, that the *Arians* were condemned by the *Anti-Arian* Bishops, as being the *major* part; neither were they allowed any other *Judge*, save these; and this, a Judgment approved by the *Protestants*. *Nestorius*, Bishop of *Constantinople*, on the one side, and *Celestine* Bishop of *Rome*, and *Cyril* of *Alexandria* on the other side, counter-accuse one another of *Heresie*; yet was *Nestorius* sentenced, and condemned, in the 3d. *General* Council, by *Celestine* presiding there by *Cyril*, his Substitute.

Dioscorus Bishop of *Alexandria* and the *Eutychian* party had great contest with the rest of Christian Bishops, *Anti-Eutychians*; proceeding so far, that *Dioscorus* with his party presumed to excommunicate *Leo*; yet was he

and

and his party judged, and condemned by the *Anti-Eutychian* party, being a *major* part in the 4th. *General* Council; the same *Leo* presiding there by his Legats, and *Dioscorus*, though the 2d. *Patriarch*, being not permitted to sit, or vote in the Council. And these Judgments approved by the *Protestants*, *Arius*, an *Alexandrian* Presbyter, and *Alexander* the Bishop there, had had much controversie between them, and accused one another, before the Council of *Nice*; yet *Alexander*, in that Council, sate as *Arius* his Judge amongst the rest, and gave his definitive vote against him. And doubtless, had *Arius* been a Bishop, and the major part of that Council *Arian*, *Arius* should have judged *Alexander* in the same manner. Allowed examples in this kind might be alledged, infinite.

2ly. Now to shew, that such judgments are lawful and obligatory, notwithstanding that the Judges are a Party, formerly accusing and accused by, the other, of corruptions, errours, usurpations, &c: I beg these three things to be granted me, having elsewhere sufficiently secured them. 1. That the *Church* is delegated, by *Christ*, as the Supream Judge on earth for all *Theological*, and *Spiritual* matters, secure for ever not to erre in necessaries; and that as a *Guide*. 2ly. That the *Judgment* of the *Bishops*, and chief Pastors of the Church, as being, at least by Ecclesiastical Constitution, and common practice of former Councils (as appears by the subscriptions to them) established the *Representative* thereof, is to be taken for that of the *Church*; or else, the judgment of all former Councils, even of the four first, may be questioned. 3ly. That the vote of the *major* part, where *all* consent not in the same judgment, must conclude the *whole*; both, for those Bishops sitting in the Council, and those Bishops absent, that accept it. §. 115. n. 1. 2.

Which *Judge*, that hath been, of all former ages, by whom Christians have been setled in truth against all former Heresies, *Arianisme*, *Nestorianisme*, *Pelagianisme*, &c, if any, because he finds it not to sute with the late *Reformation*, will now reject; let him tell us what other Judge he can put in their place? For, if this ancient and former Judge must be supposed (contrary to our *Lord's Promise*) deficient in necessaries, and incident into Heresie, Blasphemy, Idolatry; and then, if a *few* of these Ecclesiastical Governours (surmising this) against *many*, a few *Inferiors* against many their *Superiors*, only after they have first made their complaints to them, and propounded their reasons, and been rejected, may then apply themselves to procure the assistance, and power, of the temporal Magistrate, (one, who may be seduced also, and assist in a wrong cause); and so may, first, sit down in the *Chair*, and *judge* of the wilfulnes, and obstinacy, of these others in defence of their supposed errors and crimes: and then, may proceed to a reforming of the *Church*, or some part thereof, against them; (things which a late opposer of this Council † is necessitated to maintain) will not thus, the revolution of *judging* and governing in Ecclesiastical affairs, proceed *in infinitum*; and necessarily bring in a confusion of *Religions*, (as some Countries have had late experience)? For, This second *Judge*, and Reformer, and this Secular Magistrate are liable also to Heresies, Blasphemies, Idolatries: And then, how is there any remedy of these crimes and errours, unless there may be also a third Judge allowed to reform against them? † Chillingf. p. 478, 479.

them? and then, may not the *Superiors*, and *major* part, again, take their turn, to *reform* these *Reformers*? And, where will be an end of this *Controversie*, Who shall last decide Controversies? Every Judge, that we can set up, being also a *party*, and so to leave his Chair, after that there appears another to question his judgment? But, if we are to stay in some judgment, to avoid such *confusion*, where, more reasonably can we rest, than in the three former Proposals?

§. 116. And from them it will follow: 1. That those who are no *Bishops*, must be content not to be *Judges*, or to have definitive votes, in Councils: and, if any such have a controversie with, or against, Bishops, must be content, after their best informations preferr'd to that Order, to be judged by the same Bishops; who, 'tis probable, upon some new evidence, may alter their former sentences. But yet, suppose the *Inferiour Clergy* admitted to have Definitive votes, I see not, what the *Protestants* can advantage themselves thereby, as long as, if any inferior Clergy, all, must have so; and the greater number, give law to the fewer: For the inferior *Catholick Clergy*, in the time of the Council of *Trent*, far out-numbred the *Reformed*.

§. 117. 2. Again, from them it follows, That, if the Bishops are appointed the sole Judges of such matters and causes, they do not cease to be so upon any, either interest, or siding, which they may be shewed to have in the cause. And indeed, if we consider, * their former common Tenents, and practices in those things, which, upon some opposition, they meet afterward to judge; * to what side of a controversie the major part of them hath formerly inclined, or also declared for it, something of what they judge tending to their *Honour*, another to their *Profit*, another to their *Peace*, in some sense they may almost always be said to judge in their own cause; or, on their own side. So, whenever they are divided into two opinions, or parties, whoever of them judgeth here, and none may judge beside them, judgeth in his own cause. And so it is, when any one opposeth the *Church* in any of her *Traditions*, or *Doctrines*, formerly owned by her: For instance, when one opposeth the *Order of Bishops*; the just *obligation* of the Church's *Decrees*; questioneth, * Whether the *Church Governours*, succeeding the *Apostles*, hold such or such their authority *immediately* from *Christ*, independent on secular Princes? * Whether the receiving of *Holy Orders* be necessary for *administring* the *Sacraments*? * Whether *Tithes* be due, *jure divino*? In all these we must say, that the *Church* is appointed by God Judge in her own cause. Or if, in some of these things, not the *Clergy*, but the *Laity*, be the right Judge; yet so we still make him, who judgeth, to judge in his own cause, and in a matter, wherein he is interested; whilst he so much gaineth in those things; as the other loseth. Of this matter, thus Mr. *Chillingworth*: † *---- In controversies of Religion, it is in a manner impossible to be avoided, but the Judge must be a party. For, this must be the first* [Controversie], *Whether he be a Judge or no: and, in that he must be a party.* † p. 69.

§. 118. But now, suppose judging in their own cause must by no means be allowed to any; and so, the Church, about any difference, being divided into

two

two Parties, and Communions, neither muſt judge, as both being parties; and theſe perhaps very unequal, I ask, what courſe is left to end ſuch difference? [1] Shall either Party chuſe an *equal* number of Clergy with full authority to determine it? But theſe, having equal votes, will *counterpoiſe* one another, and ſo decide nothing. Or, ſuppoſe one or two ſhould, as it were, betray their truſt, and paſs over to the other ſide (for *truth*, and *error*, are not capable of *moderating* the point, and compounding the middle doctrine between both, as many other litigious matters are) yet I think no party, eſpecially the major, will ever yield to commit the future profeſſion of their *Religion* to ſuch a *chance*. [2] Or, ſhall the *Clergy* on both ſides, firſt pleading their cauſe before them, caſt the judgment and deciſion thereof upon the *Laity*? But are not the *Laity*, in matter of Religion, (which concerns all) all *parties*, as well as the *Churchmen*, and ranged, with the ſeveral diviſions of the Churchmen, in diſtinct communions? Will the *Proteſtant* be judged by the *Emperour*; or the *Roman-Catholick* by the Duke of *Saxony*, becauſe a Layman? But if an *equal* number of Laicks, becauſe theſe alſo are parties, ſhall be choſen on both ſides, whether Princes or others, the ſame accidents recur, as in taking an *equal* number of *Clergy*. Bleſſed be God, who hath eſtabliſhed a firmer courſe for the perpetual ſettlement of the peace of his Church.

§. 119. Neither belongs this courſe, of judging in their own cauſe, only to Eccleſiaſticks, but is found the ſame in the Civil, *ſupreme*, power. I ſay, *ſupreme*: For, as for inferiour Judicatures, excluſion of parties from being Judges is eaſie, by reaſon of many both collateral, and ſuperior, Courts, which may be repaired to. For the ſupreme power then; when any difference happens between a Prince and his Subjects, part of his people adhering to him, part divided from him; when a part of his Kingdom rebelleth againſt him, oppoſeth ſome part of his Royal *Prerogative*, or the equity and juſtice of ſome of his Laws; Here, 1. Either ſuch offence muſt not be judged; 2. Or, the ſupreme Magiſtrate, hearing the Plea of his Subjects, muſt judge in his own cauſe, either by *Himſelf*, or by his *Subſtitute*; which is all one, as if by himſelf: For, he can give this Subſtitute no ſuch power to judge this cauſe, unleſs he have ſuch power himſelf: Again, it is to be preſumed, that ſuch *Subſtitute* ſhall be one of his own perſwaſions: and who will think themſelves any whit relieved by having their adverſary to nominate the perſon that ſhall judge the cauſe between him, and them? But, if ſuch *Subſtitute*, by receiving new informations, may change his former judgment, ſo may the *Prince* (hearing the cauſe himſelf, and being better informed) ſo much the ſooner be hoped to change his, as he hath no other above him, whom he is bound to obſerve: 3. or 3ly. The matter muſt be referred to the arbitrement of an equal number of both parties, ſo many loyal Subjects, and ſo many Rebels; but what good iſſue can be hoped of this? 4. Or, laſtly, to the arbitrement of ſome neighbouring State. But neither may this State, being never without ſome *Intereſt* of its own, be thought an *impartial* Judge. Here then I conceive, that the conceſſion of the Statiſt will be, that the ſupreme Governour is to judge in his own cauſe, upon the penalty of *the divine revenge*, and pub-

lick

lick infamy, if he judge amiss; and then how is the same thing unjust in the Superior Governours of the *Church*? especially, when as such judgment of their's is not valid, unless it be of a major part of them.

§. 120. It follows then, from what is here said, that, in these Ecclesiastical Judgments, it is not to be considered, of what interest, or side, or how affected, these persons are, that so, if opposite to us, we may decline their Tribunal, who are by Christ appointed to judge; but, to what side it is, to which the prevalent, and major part of them is inclined; and so this to be conformed to; and any partie's appealing to a *General* Council, as hoping from it a justification of their cause, is nothing else, than the alledging, that the major part of Christian *Bishops* are already, or will, when met and arguing the case, be of their perswasion. And, for the *Appellants*, when they see the other party, in such Council, far out-numbers their's, to request or caution, this *General Council* may be composed of an equal number of both sides, is, in effect, to *appeal from it*, and to desire that the *Council* should not be *General*.

§. 121. This said (from §. 114.) That *Bishops*, the ordinary *Judges* in matters of *Religion*, though they should be parties in some sense, and, in the things to be brought before them, already declared in their present judgment on one side, yet are not therefore straight to quit the Chair, and cease to discharge their office: Especially, where the points controverted are meerly speculative, and abstracted from all secular gain, and advantage, as many of those decided in *Trent* were.

2. 2. Next, to the *Protestant's* Articles, and Exceptions made more particularly, against the *Pope*, and his *Court*; in respect of which, they would have had him at least excluded from being a Judge in this Council of *Trent*. I answer.

§. 122. 1. That he cannot be said to have been the *sole* Judge in these matters; but only to have *presided* in that Court, which was so: which he hath done often ‖ See §. 114. in former allowed Councils, when also he was a Person accused by a Party. ‖ For, every unweighty accusation is not enough to remove the *Judge* from the Bench, or alter the usual course of Justice.

§. 123. 2. Whatever *Declaration*, *Sentence*, or Censure, of a Council, this *supreme* Bishop, and *President* thereof, in some extraordinary Delinquencies (if possibly there should happen) may be liable to, as in case of *Heresie*, or some other *incorrigible tyranny*, or hainous *Crimes*, or also in his *neglect*, when so obnoxious, to call a Council, &c; in which cases some *Roman* Divines, that seem no diminishers of the *Pope's* priviledges, do freely allow as much, as can rationally be required; [As, if you have the curiosity, you may see in these places of *Bellarmin*; both, in case of his neglect in calling a Council: ---- *De Concil. l.* 1. *c.* 14. §. *Ad secundum*: and, when the Council is called, in case of *Heresie*, or other incorrigible Crime --- *Ib. c.* 9. §. *Quarta causa*; (where also the *Cardinal* urgeth the 21. Canon of the 8th. *General* Council; --- *Debent Generalia Concilia cognoscere controversias circa Rom. Pontificem exortas*); ---- *De Concil.*

Concil. l. 2. c. 19. §. Primum exemplum --- De Rom. Pontif. l. 2. c. 30. Tertia Opinio.] Or, whether it be ſtated rather; that, He having no *Superior* Judge, ſuch Enormities are for a time to be ſuffered in this *Eccleſiaſtical Supreme* (as the like miſdemeanours in *Secular* matters, are tolerated in the *Civil*) till God, whoſe vigilant providence never deſerts his Church, either *converts* Him, or *removes* Him; I ſay, however theſe things be ſtated; yet, as to our preſent buſineſs of *Trent*, neither did the *Pope*, out of any ſuch *private* guilt of *Hereſie*, or other *Crime*, forbear to call this Council; nor, when it was aſſembled, and the *Proteſtant's* complaints againſt the *Pope* well known, did this ſupreme *Court* find any ground, or cauſe of ſuch extraordinary proceedings againſt him. For 1ſt. For his *Preſidentſhip* in the Council, which was excepted againſt, how could the Council deprive him of this right, which was no new tyranny, or device, but that Office, which his Predeceſſors had anciently exerciſed in the moſt unblemiſhed Councils, which the Church ever had: Of which, ſee what is ſaid before, §. 46. *&c.* And, as for any *falſe* doctrines, *crimes*, or *corruptions*, charged on Him, this Council found none valid, as to his own perſon, either, for removal of Him from ſuch Preſidentſhip, or Depoſition from his Dignity *Pontifical*.

§. 124.

Many corruptions indeed, and great need of Reformation of ſeveral things, both in the Church, and in the Court of *Rome*, as the *Proteſtants* complain'd of, ſo the *Council*, and alſo the *Pope* himſelf, acknowledged. And, in the remedying of theſe, the Council ſpent the longer part of their Acts; which have been not *meerly delufory*, as a late Writer would blaſt them † (who muſt one day give an account to the celeſtial Majeſty of his *ſpeaking evil* of ſo *ſacred* an *Authority*): but very *effective*, as to the having produced a vigorous, and during *Reformation* in the *Roman* Church; and that, of the chiefeſt diſorders complain'd of; as is ſhewed more particularly below, §. 203. *&c.* And this *real effect* it was, which with an holy envy, the *Clergy* of *France*, diſcovered in other *Catholick* Countries, and which made them ſo importunate with the *King*, and *State* of *France*, to give them there the like force; and, that this Kingdom alone might not be deprived of ſo great a benefit. ‖ And ſo much were theſe ſevere Decrees reſented, and dreaded in the *Court* of *Rome*, that *Soave* † reports, ---- *That this Reformation was oppoſed by almoſt all the Officers of this Court, repreſenting their loſſes, and prejudices, and ſhewing how all would redound to the offence of his* Holineſs, *and of the* Apoſtolick *See, and diminution of his Revenues.* Of which, ſee much more below, §. 204. This, in the ſecond place, that the *Council*, who is only proper Judge of this *Head* of the *Church*, (if any ſo be) and of theſe matters, found no ſuch weighty accuſation againſt the *Pope's* perſon, as might juſtly abbridge any of his priviledges therein: nor, that any Reformation, in the Church, or Court, was obſtructed by his Authority.

† *Stillingf.* Rat Account. P. 482.

‖ See § 77. *&c.*

† p. 8, 6.

§. 125.

3. Laſtly. Neither doth the *Pope's* calling, or declaring the *Lutherans*, *Heretieks*, before the ſitting of this Council, render him uncapable of being *one* of their *Judges* in it: For, this prime Governour in the Church is not a Judge of *hereſie* only in the Council; and other *Popes*, as the fore-mentioned

3.

Cele-

Celestine, and *Leo*, having formerly declared against the errors of *Nestorius*, and *Dioscorus*, yet afterward, approvedly, presided in Councils, and there again condemned them. But much more might the *Pope* call the *Lutherans Hereticks*, without shew of wrong, if so be that their tenents, or some of them, had been determined-against, and condemned, in former lawful Councils: as Pope *Leo* X. in *Bull.* 8. *Jun.* 1520. pretended they were: For, if the opinion be formerly concluded *heresie*, those who own it, without a new process, may be pronounced *Hereticks*. Now, 'tis clear, that some of the *Protestant* Tenents were condemned, in the 2*d. Nicene*, in the 8*th. General* Council, in the *Lateran*, under *Innocent* 3. in that of *Florence*, in that of *Constance*. ‖ Add to this, * that *Leo* the 10*th*, who sent forth a formal Decree against *Luther*, and his followers, to be proceeded against as *Hereticks*, was deceased before this Council, and presided not in it; * that *Paul* the 3*d*. who first presided in this Council, did not formerly pass any formal sentence against the *Lutherans, as Hereticks*; but only, in his *Bull* concerning Reformation of the Court of *Rome*, *obiter* named them so, which cannot have the vertue of a judicatory Decree; yet, in his last *Bull* of the *Indiction* of the *Council* in *Trent*, forbears also to name them so: * That *Pius* the 4*th*, who renewed the Council, and concluded it, was absolutely free from giving them this offence, therefore the Acts, at least under him (enough to condemn them) are not, upon this pretence, to be invalidated. But here it must not be forgotten; that not only the *Pope*, but the *Emperour*, the King of *France*, and, sometime, the King of *England*, *Henry* the 8*th*, before the Council, pronounced them *Hereticks*; published Edicts, and denounced heavy punishments, against them; and yet, afterward they did not, for this, utterly decline these *Prince's* judgments, as hoping that such proceedings might be, upon better informations, and second considerations, reversible.

‖ See below §. 198.

§. 126.

† *Stillingf.* Rat. Account. *p.* 492.

To the Question, asked here, † ---- *If the Protestant opinions were condemned for Heresies before, by General Councils, why was the Council of* Trent *at all summoned?* It is easily answered, 1st. That, though many of the *Protestant* Tenents had been considered, and condemned in former Councils, yet not all, because some of them not then appearing. 2ly. Had all been so: yet, that it is not unusual both to Ecclesiastical, and Civil Courts, to reiterate their sentence; and by new Declarations (and perhaps new reasons too) to enforce their former Laws, and Decrees, so long as a considerable party continues to gain-say, and disobey, them; whereby is yielded also a Testimony to the world, that the present Church-Governours persever both in the *faith* of their Predecessors, and in their *Resolution*, for the maintenance thereof. So, *Arianisme*, after the *Nicene*, was condemned again, by way of a continued Testimony to the truth of *Consubstantialiey*, by the Council of *Sardica*; and *Berengarius*, and his party, being condemned by five several Councils, before the great *Lateran*, and that of *Florence*, yet did not these forbear to reiterate the *condemnation*, so long as others continued to maintain the *Heresie*.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

II. Head. *The invalidity of such a Council, as the* Protestants *demanded.*

The Protestant-*Demands.* §. 127.
The unreasonableness of these Demands. §. 132.
Where,
Of the fruitlesness of many Diets (*framed according to the* Protestant-*Proposals*) *to decide their Controversies.* §. 135. &c.

THus much from §. 53. of the *first* General Head I proposed (§. 8.) concerning the sufficient *Generality* of this *Council*, to render it obligatory. §. 127.
Now I pass to the *second*; concerning the novelty, Canonical invalidity, and, probably, ineffectiveness (as to their carrying the cause) of such a *General* Council, as the *Protestants* demanded in stead of that of *Trent*, and as should be regulated with all their Conditions.

Luther, the first *Parent* of this new *Sect*, being questioned for his Doctrines, and upon this cited to *Rome*, first made Friends to have his cause tried in *Germany*; having been heard and condemned in *Germany* (by Cardinal *Cajetan*, for one, a moderate and learned Prelate) he now appeal'd to *Rome*, and to the *Pope*. But well perceiving, that his Doctrine would also be most certainly condemned there, as it was: he suddenly intercepted this Appeal with another, † made from the *Pope* to a *Council*; having some ground to imagine, that such a *Body* would never be conven'd to hear his cause, nor the *Pope* call them together, from whom was expected a severe *Reformation* of *Him*, and his *Court*. But afterward, seeing that in good earnest such a *Council* there would be, (for a *Bull* was published for one to be held at *Vicenza*, in 1537.) and well discerning, that neither thus (the usual former laws of Councils being observed: or only this law of all Assemblies; that the much *major* part shall conclude the *whole*) his Doctrine could stand (as indeed it did not), He began now to vilifie Councils, and put out a book *De Conciliis*, in, 1539. wherein he declares, no good, but much hurt to have come to the Church by those that had been held formerly; not sparing the very *First*, reverenced by the whole Christian world; not that of *Nice*; not that of the *Apostles*, *Act. c.* 15. Some of his Invectives I have set down already, in *isc.* 3. §. 78. *n.* 3. and so here forbear to repeat them. Upon this therefore his last Appeal was from *Councils* to the *Holy Scriptures* (defending himself with a --- *S. Angelus de Cœlo*, Gal. 1. 8. --- *Attendite à falsis Prophetis.* ‖ *Oves mea vocem meam audiunt.* † *Omnia probantes*, ‖ &c). And here he knew himself safe (as any *Heresie*, though never so absurd, would be) in chusing that to be the *Judge*, or decider of the Controversie, which could never deliver any *new*

† See *Adam Vita Lutheri*.

‖ *Mat* 17. 15. † *Jo.* 10 ‖ 1 *Thess* 5. 21.

sentence on any side; and where the meaning of its former *Sentence* deliver'd already, which all will stand to, were it known, is the *controversie* to be decided.

But his followers, rather than utterly to decline a *Council*, which they had formerly, to avoid the standing *Church-authorities*, often called for, thought fit to change the ancient form thereof, and to clog it with such *Conditions*, as, if accepted, should perfectly secure them from any danger from it. Now the Conditions, as they are most fully set down in *Soave*, p. 642. though often mentioned elsewhere, † are these. 1. *That it should not be called by the* Pope. 2. *That it should be celebrated in* Germany, *according to the Canon*, ut illic lites terminentur, ubi exortæ sunt. 3. *That the* Pope *should not* preside *in, but only be part of, the* Council, *and subject to the determinations thereof.* 4. *That the* Bishops *should be free from their* Oath *given to the* Pope, *that so they may freely, and without impediment, deliver their opinions.* 5. *That the* Protestant Divines, *sent to the Council, might have a* deciding *voice with the rest.* 6. *That the* Holy Scriptures *might be* Judge *in the Council, and all* humane *authority excluded.*

† See *Soave*, p. 18, 65, 80.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6.

§. 118.

Where note; that, by humane authority, they would exclude, amongst other things, *Apostolorum traditiones, Concilia, & authoritates S. Patrum:* Which, together with the *Holy Scriptures*, (as necessary to know the true meaning of them, where it is disputed) was the *Rule* that the *Council* entertained, to decide present controversies by. Of which see *Soave, l.* 4. *p.* 344. and 323. where he saith; the Council prescribed this *Rule* to the *Divines*, in their disputations about the Articles proposed to them, *That they ought to confirm their opinions with the Holy Scriptures, Traditions of the Apostles, sacred and approved Councils, and by the Constitutions and Authorities of the Holy Fathers; to avoid superfluous and unprofitable questions, and perverse contentions.* Which rule to judge controversies by, was also mentioned in the Safe-conduct: --- *Quòd causa controversa secundum S. Scripturam, & Apostolorum traditiones, probata Concilia, Catholica Ecclesia consensum, & S. Patrum authoritates tractentur in prædicto Concilio*: and which also, long before this, was mentioned, in the beginning of the Council, *Sess.* 4. where a Decree was made, ---- *Ad coercenda petulantia ingenia; ut nemo, suæ prudentiæ innixus in rebus fidei, &c, Scripturam sacram interpretari audeat contra eum sensum, quem tenuit, & tenet, sancta Mater Ecclesia, aut etiam contra unanimem consensum Patrum.* And such an advice and rule as this, we find given, not long after the second *General* Council, to *Theodosius* the *Emperour* in a time much overrun with divers Heresies: which *Emperour* thinking, that all *Sects* might easily be united in the Truth, by convocating them all together, and permitting a free *Disputation*; *Nectarius* Bishop of *Constantinople*, with others, rather perswaded him to take this course: ---- *Ut fugeret* [to give you it in *Sozomen's* words ‖] *institutas cum sectariis disputationes, utpote rixarum atque pugnarum fomites: Sed ex ipsis quæreret, reciperent ne eos, qui, ante eccl sia distractionem, interpretes, ac Doctores fuissent Scripturæ sacræ? Etenim, si horum Testimonia rejecerint, à suis ipsorum consortibus explodentur, sin autem sufficere eos ad controversias decidendas arbitrabuntur, produci oportet eorum libros,* &c. By which

‖ *Sozom. l.* 7. *c.* 12. *Socrat. l.* 5. 6, 10.

which books they would ſoon be convinced of their errour; which advice the Pious *Emperour* commending, and propoſing this way of ending Controverſie to the Heads of the Sectaries, they ſoon diſcovered to him their tergiverſation; and He thereupon authorizing only the *Catholick* Religion, vigorouſly undertook the ſuppreſſion of the reſt. Sutable to this; among thoſe General Propoſals, made by the *Pope's Nuncios* in *Germany*, and elſewhere, before the ſitting of this Council, this was the firſt: † --- *That the Council might be free, and be celebrated in the manner uſed by the Church, even from the beginning of the firſt General Councils*; and the ſecond, *That all thoſe, who met in the Council, ſhould engage to ſubmit to the Decrees thereof.* Things to which the *Proteſtants* would no way conſent. The clauſe contained in the Safe-conduct of deciding controverſies, *per probata Concilia* &c they excepted againſt (ſee *Soave*, p. 344, and 372. and before, §. 104.): and they refuſed alſo to ſtand to any Council, that ſhould proceed as the uſe had been for 800. years before. ‖ Here, then, at that time thus the caſe ſtood, The *Pope*, and the *Tridentine Fathers* were for *admitting*; the *Proteſtants* for *excluding*, the Form of a Council agreeable with the former: and again, the one for admitting; the other for excluding, a trial in this Council, as formerly, by *Church-Tradition*, *Councils*, and *Fathers*, interpreting *Scriptures* controverted. But, now, the Learned amongſt the *Reformed*, perhaps like the ancient Sectariſts, but now mentioned, *ne à ſuis ipſorum conſortibus explodantur*, think fit to take another way, and do profeſs their doctrines to be confirmed, as the *Roman*, overthrown, by thoſe ſame ancient *Councils* and *Fathers*. Whereby we are now made believe, that theſe their Fore-Fathers mainly *declined* that Authority, which clearly *eſtabliſhed* their opinions; and, on the otherſide, the *Roman-Catholicks*, together with the *Pope*, vehemently contended-for that Authority, that manifeſtly ruined their's.

† *Pallavic. l. 3. c. 13. n. 2.* — *Soave p. 64.*

‖ *Soave p. 181.*

7. Their ſeventh condition ſutably was, *That the deciſions in Council ſhould not be made by* plurality *of voices, but that the more ſound opinions ſhould be preferred*; i. e. *thoſe opinions, which were regulated by the word of God.*

§. 129. 7.

8. *That, if a* Concord *in* Religion *cannot be concluded in the* Council, [*i. e.* if the *Proteſtants* do not conſent to what the reſt of the Council approve] *the conditions of* Paſſau *may remain inviolable; and the peace of Religion made in* Ausburg, *A. D.* 1555. *continue in force.* [Now the conditions agreed on in *Paſſau* and *Ausburg* between the Emperour and Proteſtants, were, *A toleration of all ſects; that every one might follow what religion pleaſeth them beſt*: as you may ſee in *Soave*, p. 378. and 393.]

8.

The ſum therefore of the fifth, ſeventh, and eighth condition, is this. Of the Fifth, that *Proteſtants* ſhall vote in the Council *definitively* together with the *Catholicks*; but this, the *Proteſtants* muſt needs ſee, by the *Catholicks* over-numbring them, would ſignifie little: Therefore the ſeventh condition cautioneth, that, if there be more votes againſt the Proteſtant-tenents, than for them; yet this *plurality* may not carry the buſineſs; but, that their opinion, if the *more ſound*, though it have fewer Suffrages, ſhall be preferred. But again, this they ſaw was very unlikely; either that the others, who voted againſt their opinion, ſhould judge it the more ſound; or, themſelves

§. 130.

selves only judging it more sound, that the others upon this should prefer it. Therefore the 8th. condition makes sure work: that, if the rest of the Council will not prefer the Protestant-opinions, yet they shall not condemn, but allow every one, that pleaseth, still to retain them: and on these *conditions* they will submit to a *Council.*

§. 131. 9. And there was besides these yet another Protestant-Proposal made, which see in *Soave*, p. 369. --- *That the Protestant-doctrines being repugnant to those of the Pope, and of the Bishops his adherents; and it being unjust, that either the* Plaintiff, *or the* Defendant, *should be the judge, therefore that, the* Divines *on one part and on the other arguing for their own tenents, there might be* Judges *indifferently chosen by both sides, to take knowledge of the controversies.*

§. 132. In satisfaction to these their demands. To the first, see what is said above, §. 47. and §. 80.

To 1. To 2. To the second, what is said §. 83. *&c.* To the Canon urged, See *Bellarmin's* answer, *de Concil. l.* 1. *c.* 21. The Canon intends *criminal* matters, where witnesses are necessary; not matters of *faith.* The controversie arising in *Antioch* was judged at *Jerusalem*; *Arianisme*, arising in *Alexandria*, judged at *Nice* in *Bithynia.*

To 3. To the third, see what is said before, §. 114. and 122. And methinks the *Emperour's* answer returned to it (in *Soave.* p. 80.) is sufficient. ---- *That in case the Protestants had any complaint against the Pope they might modestly prosecute it in the Council* [to which it belongs, according to the 21. Canon of the 8th. *General* Council, recited before, *cognoscere controversias circa Romanum Pontificem exortas*]. *And, that for the manner and Form. it was not convenient, that they should prescribe it to all Nations, nor think their Divines only inspired by God,* &c.

To 4. To the fourth, what is said, §. 105. *&c.* And; that, *de facto*, such Oath restrained not the Council's freedome, was seen in several controversies, that were hotly agitated in the Council between the *Pope's*, and a contrary, party, about *Episcopal Jurisdiction*, &c.

To 5. To the fifth, what is said, §. 68. *n.* 2. --- 115. *&c.* --- and 118. where it is also shewed, by the suppositions there made, that, had such *decisive vote* been granted to the *Protestants*, it would have nothing promoted their cause; unless perhaps they think, that the evident *arguments*, which the *Reformed* would there have manifested for the truth of their tenents, would have converted so many of their adversaries, as, joined with them, would have made a *major* part in the Council. But, besides these arguments seen, and diligently examin'd by divers of the Council, in their *books* (who also gathered out of these books the dangerous doctrines fit to be condemned) without working any such effect upon them, what success their disputations would have had in the *Council*, may be gathered, * from that which they had in the *German Diets*; from which their *Catholick* Antagonists departed still as constant, and inflexible in their former perswasions, as themselves: and * from that effect which they have in *Christendome*, ever since that Council, to this day; the major part, undeniably, remaining still *Catholick*; and the other of late much decreasing.

To

To the sixth, I have said much elsewhere; which you may remember. §. 133.

Surely, * nothing can be more reasonable and just, when the sense of the *Holy Scriptures* between two opposite parties is the thing questioned and doubted of, than that the litigants, for what is either said in the *Scriptures*, or necessarily deduced from them, stand to the judgment and the expositions of the former *Fathers* and *Councils* of the Church: and he, that disclaims to be tried by these concerning the controverted sense of *Scriptures*, doth me thinks sufficiently acknowledge, that these *Fathers*, and *Councils*, are against him; and this again seems a sufficient *autocatacrisie*.---*When you and I differ upon the interpretation of Scripture* (saith King *Charles* † of blessed memory, to his weak Antagonist, Mr. *Henderson*); *and I appeale to the practice of the primitive Church, and the universal consent of Fathers to be judge between us; me thinks you should either find a fitter, or submit to what I offer. Neither have you shewn how, waving those Judges I appeale unto, the mischief of the interpretation by private spirits can be prevented.*--- and again. †---*When we differ about the meaning of the Scripture, certainly there ought to be for this, as well as other things, a rule, or a Judge between us to determine our differences.* Thus, against *Puritans*, against *Socinians*, *&c*, the Church of *England* sees most clearly those things, wherein her eyes are shut, against *Catholicks*. But, set this *humane Authority* quite aside, the same words of *Scripture* being diversly interpreted by two sides, the *Scripture* can no more judge on the *Protestant* side, than on the other, because it saith only the same words to, or for, both; and thus, as by other *humane authority* allowed, the *Catholicks* will have the victory; so, *Scripture* being the sole Judge, the *Protestant* can have no conquest, but the contention will still be depending. (So the King, *Ibid.*)---*We must find some Rule to judge betwixt us, when you and I differ upon the interpretation of the self-same Text, or it can never determine our question.* As we see amongst the *reformed* also of those days; that, the *Scriptures* being made sole judge or rule to try their doctrines by, yet by it could they not, then, accord the differences amongst themselves; how then might they hope by it solely to decide the differences between them, and the *Roman-Catholicks*? ². Again; * It is yet more unreasonable and unjust; so to bind over the *Council*, or the *Church*, to the Test of Scripture, as that all their *Constitutions*, or *Injunctions*, shall be cassated, and rejected, if not shewed to be commanded also in *Scripture*. It is sufficient, that such Injunctions cannot be shewn, by the adverse party, to be *against Scripture*. For, the Church hath power in things indifferent: And so much, as is not prohibited, is lawful.

† 3d. Paper.

† 4th. Paper.

To the Seventh, it is easily granted; that the *more sound* opinion be preferred; but, take away *plurality* of votes in the Council, the supreme Judge in these matters, and what course shall be used to judge, or decide, which opinion is the more sound? See the insufficiency of those ways proposed, §. 115. *n.* 2. and 118. *&c.* §. 134. To 7.

To the Eighth, What is this, but saying, that they will be judged by a *Council*, upon condition, that the Council will judge either for, or not against, *them*? And, what a ridiculous thing would it seem even to a *Protestant*, if any opinion, which they dislike, (suppose the *Arian*, or *Nestorian*) To 8.

should

should have thus capitulated before-hand with Councils, and yielded to be examined by them, after it hath first tied their hands, to decree nothing against it?

§. 135. In satisfaction to the Ninth, concerning an equal number on both sides to determine their controversies, see what is said above, §. 118. And, besides, that this seems not appealing to the judgment of a *General Council*, but rather, from it, to a *private Committee*; and that it is no more reasonable to propose this, than that an equal number of *Arians*, and *Anti-Arians*, should judge of *Arianisme*; the experiment of this device in so many *Diets* of *Germany*, still fruitless, shews, it would have been so also in *Trent*.

199.

And here, 'Tis worth your diversion to view a little with me the unsatisfying issue of those many *Diets*.

§. 136. The *Emperour*, sometimes from the pressing of forreign war (from the *Turk*, who in those times frequently alarm'd *Germany*, to the great growth of *Protestancy*) sometimes for fear of civil; or, from some discords arising with neighbouring Princes, exceedingly desirous to settle a peace in *Germany*, had many *Conferences* and *Diets*, in several places, for composing the differences in Religion.

Diet, 1530. A. D. 1530. Was held a *Diet* at *Ausburg*; where the *Protestants* exhibited the Confession of their faith, called the *Augustan* Confession, and here seven *Catholicks*, and seven *Protestants* (on either side, two Princes, two Lawyers, and three Divines) were chosen to confer together, and find out a means of composition: and, these not being able to agree, afterward the number was restrained to three a piece. *But* (saith *Soave*, *l.* 1. *p.* 56.) *though some few small points of doctrine, and other petty things belonging to some rites, were agreed on; yet, in conclusion, it was perceived, that the Conference could produce no concord at all; because neither party was willing to grant to the other any thing of importance.* Or, if any thing of importance was there yielded, it was by the *Protestant* party, for which see, *Pall*: *l.* 3. *c.* 4.

§. 137. A. D. 1541. Was held a Conference at *Ratisbon*, where, the *Emperour* himself being present, and two Presidents, of the Colloquy appointed, three *Catholicks*, and three *Protestant* Divines were chosen to determine and compose the differences; and *Calvin* was present at it, though not yet much noted: 22. *Articles* were drawn up by some *Catholicks*, and proposed by the *Emperour*, as an argument and subject of what they ought to treat: and in these *Articles*, and in those afterward, of the *Interim*, was the neareſt approach made to any agreement, since the *Reformation*: and the accord here made concerning *Justification*, is worth your reading, the *Catholick* party purposely omitting the word [*Merit*] that they might not give an offence in the expression, where both agreed in the sense. See *Pall. l.* 4. *c.* 14. *n.* 8. Yet of these 22. those Articles, which contained the things most controverted, could not be agreed on: [Amongst which, these: *De summè venerando Sacramento veri corporis, & sanguinis Christi: & de hujus adoratione & reservatione. De Transubstantiatione panis & vini. De Missâ. De Conjugio Sacerdotum. De Communione*

Diet, 1541.

manieno Sacramenti ſub utrâq; ſpecie. De Panitentiâ, Confeſſione, & Satisfactione. De Invocatione Sanctorum. De Eccleſia Hierarchico ordine. De Eccleſiæ & Conciliorum authoritate, and ſeveral others]. And the other few that were agreed on; as, *De libero Arbitrio. De Originali peccato. De Juſtificatione hominis. De Panitentiâ poſt lapſum*, &c, were by both parties afterward diverſly expounded, and equally complained of, as *perplexed* and *ambiguous*, and not clearly expreſſing the Truth; and particularly, by the *Catholick* party; as changing the former Church-language; and alſo ſtating ſuch evident matters, as were no way formerly controverted amongſt the learned. (See *Reſponſum Principum Proteſtantium*, penn'd by *P. Melanthon*---and *Reſponſum Principum, qui Rom. Pontificem agnoſcunt*). And ſo this meeting ended without effecting a peace. See *Soave*, *l.* 1. *p.* 95.

§. 138. Diet, 1546.

Theſe meetings were before the Council of *Trent*. Afterward, in the time of the Council 1546. was another Colloquy appointed at *Ratisbone*, *four Divines* on a ſide, and two Judges. *But no good fruit grew thereof* (ſaith *Soave*, *l.* 2. *p.* 148.). *by reaſon of the ſuſpicions, which one part conceived againſt the other; and becauſe the Catholicks omitted no occaſions to give greater jealouſies to the other ſide, and to feign them of their own, which finally made the Colloquy to diſſolve.* Thus *Soave*, blaming the *Catholicks*; but ſee *Spondanus* † and the Authors he cites, charging the fault on the *Proteſtant* ſide, deſerting the Colloquy, recalled by the Princes that ſent them.

† *A. D.* 1546. *n.* 10.

§. 139. *n.* 1. Diet, 1547.

After this, A. D. 1547. upon the *Emperour's* great victory obtained over the *Proteſtants*, and no hopes of the Council's return from *Bologna*, (whither it was removed by reaſon of the Plague) to *Trent*, a *Diet* was held at *Auſburg*, where the *Emperour*, reſolving; before he diſarmed, to ſet *Germany* at peace in matters of Religion, elected *three*, two of them *Catholicks*, the third, *Joannes Agricola Iſlebius*, a moderate *Proteſtant*; or one, that had been ſo, but who was now returned to the *Catholick* Profeſſion, ‖ to compoſe or peruſe a new moderated *form of Religion*, commonly called the *Interim*, which was afterwards alſo reviewed, and changed by many others, ſome of the principal Miniſters of the *Proteſtants* being alſo called, that they might approve it, † amongſt whom, *Bucer*. It contained 25. *heads*, beſides other heads of *Reformation*; preſcribing what men were to believe, until all ſhould be eſtabliſhed by a *General* Council. If you would know the temper of this famous draught; *Pallavacin* (in *l.* 10. *c.* 17. *n.* 1). gives this account of it,--- *That in many of the Articles, and eſpecially in thoſe concerning the* Sacraments, *this writing contradicted the* Lutheran *errors; but, that, in the reſt, it was a contexture of ambiguous forms, ſuch as each party might interpret to his own liking. Whence the three Superviſors of it gave in this relation; that, rightly underſtood, it did in nothing oppoſe the* Catholick *doctrines, except only that Marriage of* Prieſts, *and the Communion of the Cup were therein permitted; yet ſo, as not there approved for lawful, but tolerated till a General Council ſhould decree, what was moſt fit to be done therein.*

‖ *Spondan.* A. D. 1548. *n.* 4.

† *Soave*, *p.* 188.

§ 139. *n.* 2.

In this Inſtrument chiefly was experimented, both what Union and Peace, a *Confeſſion* of *Faith*, compoſed in general, and ambiguous terms for men of contrary perſwaſions, was able to produce: And what ſatisfaction a Tole-

Toleration of the *Cup*, and of *Priest's Marriage*, might give to the *Protestants*, to induce them happily to a compliance with *Catholicks* in other Points. And it was found, that nothing was promoted hereby. Many *Exceptions Catholicks* took at several of these Articles (which see collected by *Soave*, p. 289.): and *Protestants, more:* who also pleaded, ‖ ---That it was a matter concerning their Conscience, and that therein they might not be forced. Generally, all sides contended to have the Profession of their Faith more clear, distinct, and particular. And---*In a short time* (saith *Soave* †) *there was, as it were, a whole Squadron of Writers against it: Catholicks and Protestants* [amongst whom *Calvin*]. *And that did follow, which doth ordinarily happen to him, that will reconcile contrary Opinions, that he maketh them both to agree to impugne his; and every one more obstinate in defending his own.* And the Composers thereof (saith *Spondanus* †) *Illud suis commixtionibus ac palpationibus assecuti sunt, ut neq; Protestantibus, Lutheranis, neque ullis aliis Haereticis, neque Catholicis probatum fuerit ipsorum opus.* Only from this *Interim* there arose *two Sects* amongst the *Protestants*; one, (being more under *Cesar's* power) embracing, and so justifying the use of some old Ceremonies required by him, called therefore, *Adiaphorists*; which the others, that were free from *Cesar's* power disallowed. See, *Soave*, Ibid.

Soave p. 306.

† p. 295.

† A. D. 1548. n. 5.

§. 139. n. 3.

But so it was; That, after the yoke of this *State-composition* of Religion had been, for three or four years, impatiently born by both parties; As, upon the *Emperour's* victory over the *Protestants*, *A. D.* 1547, it was set up and imposed: so by another victory of the *Protestants* over Him, in 1552, when also the *Council* was dispersed, † it was quite thrown off: And, the *Emperour's* former prosperous fortune, from this very time of his setting up the *Interim*, more and more declining, some stick not to impute it to this his usurping, being a *Laick*, such a supreme Arbitration in matters of *Religion*.

† See before §. 63. n. 2.

§. 140. 1552.

So: A. D. 1552. was an agreement made, after the *Emperour's* ill success, of a mutual Toleration in the States of the *German* Princes, each meanwhile following which pleased him best, of both Religions: *viz.* the *Catholick*, and that of the *Augustan Confession*, or the *Lutheran*: all other *Protestant newer* Sects, as more distant from the *Catholick*, being excluded: With which Sects, *Germany*, and other parts were now much afflicted, these still removing further, and further, from the former *Catholick* Faith. Some of which new Sects, at least it was hoped, by this means also might the easilier be suppressed. And this *Concord* was made, till a further settlement of Religion, and union of Opinions could be procured by one of these *four* means: 1. A *General Council* (for the sitting of that at *Trent* was now broken up) Or, 2. A *National*: or, 3. a *Colloquy*: or, 4. an *Universal Diet* of the Empire.

§. 141. 1555.

There followed after this, A. D. 1555. during the Suspension of the Council of *Trent*, a renewed Attempt, in another *Diet* at *Ausburg*, to put some of the forementioned ways for accommodating matters of Religion in execution. *But* (saith *Soave* †) *two proposals being made: One, to treat of the means of Reforming Religion: the other, to leave every one to his* Liberty, *not knowing*

† p. 393. 389.

knowing, how to root out the evil humors, which did ſtill move, all inclined to the ſecond *propoſition* [the continuation of a toleration]. Of which Toleration, ſee the Articles ſet down in *Pallavicin. l.* 13. *c.* 13. *n.* 4.

§. 142. A. D. 1557. During the ſame Suſpenſion of the Council, yet another attempt was made. And, of the *four* ways, named before, the *third* was pitched upon, a *Colloquy*, to be held at *Wormes*. Wherein was appointed a Conference of *twelve Catholick*, and *twelve Proteſtant* Divines on a ſide, the Biſhop of *Naumburg* being Preſident. The Collocutors met, here firſt a Diſputation was ſet on foot, *De Normâ Judicii*: † The *Catholicks*, beſides the *Scriptures*, requiring, for Deciſion of Controverſies, the Interpretation of the *Fathers*, and *Ancient* Church; the *Proteſtants* admitting only the *Scriptures*. Next, it was propoſed, That, ſince all other *Proteſtant* Sects were excluded from a Toleration, ſave only thoſe of the *Auguſtan Confeſſion*, the Collocutors ſhould firſt declare themſelves, as to the condemning and rejecting thoſe other Sects, the *Zuinglians*, *Oſiandrians*, &c, in many things, and particularly in the main *doctrine* touching the *Euchariſt*, much more diſtant from the *Roman-Catholick* Religion, than thoſe of the *Auguſtan* Confeſſion were. To this motion *five* of the *Proteſtant* Divines willingly agreed, and gave up their *Declaration* herein to the Preſident. But the other ſeven, amongſt whom was *Melancthon*, oppoſed it. And the difference between them, and the other five, grew ſo high, that theſe latter departed from the Colloquy, and ſo it was diſſolv'd. And this was the laſt *Colloquy*, or Compoſition of Religion, that was aſſayed in *Germany*, I mean, between the *Proteſtant* and *Catholick* Party: The Proteſtant-differences among themſelves, which ſtill grew more, and could never ſince be healed, hindring any further Treaties of their accord with *Catholicks* (who expected their fall, at leaſt by their own hands). And all theſe aſſayes of ſetling Religion by the *State*, and not by the *Eccleſiaſtical Authority*, that is the ordinary Judge thereof, thus proved vain and fruitleſs.

1557. † *Spondan.* A. D. 1557. n. 15.

§ 143. After this A. D. 1561. a little before the renewing of the Council of *Trent*, in *Pius* the Fourth's time, there was held a *Colloquy* at *Poiſſy* in *France*: the King and Queen of *France* being preſent thereat, and *fourteen Proteſtant* Divines ſelected for it with Safe-conduct: and here, after much diſputing at large, *five* of a ſide were choſen, to ſee if they could compoſe differences.---*Theſe aſſayed* (ſaith *Soave*, p. 454) *to frame an Article concerning the* Euchariſt [the chief point of controverſie] *in general terms taken out of the* Fathers, *which might give ſatisfaction to both parties; which becauſe they could not do, they concluded the Colloquy.*

1561.

§. 144. In this year alſo, the *Princes* of the *Auguſtan* Confeſſion in *Germany* (which Confeſſioniſts alſo were at variance among themſelves) aſſembled at *Neumburg*, where, —— *Being aſhamed,* (ſaith *Soave*, p. 439). *that their Religion ſhould be eſteemed a confuſion for the variety of doctrines amongſt them, they did propoſe, that they might firſt agree in one; and then reſolve, whether they ought to refuſe, or accept, the Synod* [that under *Pius* 4. now ready to be opened]. And here, after ſome things had been propoſed for a *covering* at leaſt of their differences, which could not be cloſed, (for, though here they had ſole *Scripture* for their Rule, and themſelves for their Judges, yet it ſeems they could not agree them): —— *The*

Duke of Saxony (saith the same Author) *answered; that they could not stop the eyes and ears of the world, that they should not see and hear their differences; and that, if they would make shew of union, where they were at variance, they should be convinced of vanity and lying: and so* (saith *Soave*) *after many contentions, they remained without agreement in this matter.*

§. 145. These *Diets* and Colloquies about settling Religion, I have been the more willing particularly to relate; * partly, to remove that conceit of many; that, if the *Protestant*-Divines had but had a *fair hearing* of their cause in the Council of *Trent*, a major part would have consented to them: whereas we see many a free, and fair, hearing of them, here, was, in so many *Conferences*; and yet none of their Antagonists of the *Catholick* party removed thereby from their former principles. * And partly to shew you, what is most likely to have been the issue of such a *General* Council, as the *Protestants* called for; *i. e.* where an equal number, chosen on both sides (suppose Lay-persons) should have sitten the *Presidents*, and *Judges*; and to make appear, that, if once we take away the authority of *Councils*, as constituted, and composed in the manner always formerly used, there is no hope of settling Divinity-controversies by Arbitrators. For, men will submit to nothing against their private, reasons, or judgment; *i. e.* against their Conscience, as many call it; unless it be, when such persons have decided such a point, whose authority they are obliged, in conscience, to obey.

§. 146. This is said to the *Conditions* of a *General* Council which the *Protestants* of those times demanded. But, if those conditions only were required, which Archbishop *Laud* mentions, §. 30. (though, §. 27. he seems to exact much more), who there saith; ——*That any General Council shall satisfie him, that is lawfully called, continued, and ended, according to the same course, and under the same conditions, which* General *Councils observed in the primitive Church*: Where he refers, in the margent, to *Bellarmin's* four Conditions, ---*de Concil. l.* 1. *c.* 17. [namely,]——1. *Ut Evocatio sit generalis, ita ut innotescat omnibus majoribus Christianis provinciis.* 2. *Ut ex Episcopis non excommunicatis nullus excludatur.* 3. *Ut adsint, per se, vel per alios, quatuor præcipui Patriarchæ præter summum Pontificem, quia istis subsunt omnes alii Episcopi* (but to this *Bellarmin* adds some limitations). 4. *Ut saltem ex majori parte Christianarum Provinciarum aliqui adveniant*]; then, I say, as these conditions are most reasonable, so, I think, they have been already shewed to agree to the Council of *Trent*; excepting the third; of the dispensableness of which, in several cases, see both what *Bellarmin* there saith; and what is said above, §. 65. 66; Neither, if men would be content, with Bishop *Bramhal*, (in *Præfat.* to *Repl.* to *Chalc.*) to submit themselves to *so General* a Council, as can be procured, as things now are, can there be any debate about this *Condition*.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

III. Head. *Of the Legalneſs of the proceedings of this Council.*

1. *That a Council may be Legal, and Obligatory, in ſome of its Acts, when not, in others.* §. 147.
2. *That no Decree concerning Faith was paſſed in this Council, where any conſiderable party contradicted.* §. 148.
3. *That there was no need of uſing any violence upon the Council for the condemning of the Proteſtant-Opinions; in condemning which, the Fathers of this Council unanimouſly agreed.* §. 150.
4. *That no violence was uſed upon the Council, for defining of Points, debated between the* Catholicks *themſelves.* §. 152.

Where,

Of the Council's proceedings, touching the chief points in debate,

Touching, 1. *Epiſcopal Reſidency,* &c.
2. *Epiſcopal Juriſdiction,* &c.
3. *The* Pope's *Superiority to* Councils. §. 155.

That theſe three Points of Controverſy, however ſtated, are of no great advantage to the Reformed. §. 156.

5. *That no violence was uſed upon the Council, for hindring any juſt Reformations.* §. 157.

THus much (from §. ~~127.~~) of the ſecond Head propoſed; the *Conditions* of a *General* Council, which the *Proteſtants* required. Now let us conſider the third, *concerning the legal proceedings of the Council of* Trent. §. 147.

Where firſt, you muſt remember: That a *Council* proved *illegal*, or not *free*, in ſome of its proceedings, cannot therefore juſtly be rejected in all other its acts whatſoever; but only in thoſe, that are firſt proved to be *illegal*, and *not free*; and to be reputed as ſuch, or at leaſt not *accepted* as the contrary, by that Eccleſiaſtical Authority, which legally concludes the *whole*. For, the ſame Council may become obligatory in ſome of its Acts, when not in others, as thoſe ſhall conſent to ſome Acts, diſſent from others, without whoſe acceptance none are ratified. And ſo it was in the fourth *General* Council of *Chalcedon*; Whoſe Decrees, though for other matters, confirm'd; yet its 27th Canon, in the preference of the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, before the *2d.* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, being diſallowed by the *Roman*, and the other *Weſtern* Biſhops, doubtleſs, hence, was of no force, till afterward this was alſo by them conſented to. Neither, if *we* can ſhew in ſome Council, that the *Prime Patriarch*, preſiding in it, or the *major* part of Church-Governours (who were abſent) have rejected ſome particular Canons thereof, can *we*, here, plead our ſelves free from obedience for all the reſt (ſee ſuch arguing in Dr. *Hammond*, of Hereſie, §. 9. *n.* 6. and §. 11. *n.* 3, 7.) which both he, and the

major part of the Church, have allowed, and conform to. For thus, the *Eutychian* might plead his freedome from any obligation to thoſe Canons of *Chalcedon* that were *univerſally* agreed on by *Eaſt* and *Weſt*, becauſe the 27th. Canon forementioned, touching another matter, was refuſed to be ratified by the *Pope*, and *Weſtern* Biſhops. Or *Dioſcorus* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, there condemned, might juſtly plead: That, becauſe, without the conſent of the Biſhop of *Rome*, and all thoſe of the *Weſt*, the Conſtitutions of the *ſecond Epheſine* Council were of no force, therefore neither thoſe of *Chalcedon* were ſo, without his. Or, an ordinary Biſhop, in a Provincial Council, might plead; that, becauſe, the *Metropolitan*, by the Canon, exerciſeth a negative power and voice, for matters voted therein, therefore *he* alſo, where he thinks fit, will uſe, and claim the like. Neither will the Illegalneſs, or non-freedome of any Conciliary Act, pretended by a few, ſignifie any thing, when the contrary is declared, or ſuch Act is accepted, by ſo *great* and *dignified* a part of the Church beſides, as doth lawfully conclude the *whole*. For, ſuppoſe whatever *irregularity* in the making of ſuch a Decree, yet this *Acceptation* and acknowledgment clears it of ſuch former blemiſh, and gives it a juſt force.

§. 148. 2ly. Obſerve, what *Soave* confeſſeth, p. 576. —— *That it was a general Maxime in this Council; that, to eſtabliſh a Decree of Reformation, a major part of voices was ſufficient; but, that a Decree of Faith could not be made, if a conſiderable part did contradict.* Where alſo he ſaith, —— *That, becauſe hardly more than half of the Fathers would conſent, that the allowance of the Cup ſhould be referred to the Pope's pleaſure,* [namely, thoſe Fathers refuſing this reference, who thought it not fit to be allowed at all] *therefore the Legates made it one of the Articles of Reformation;* —— *and that ſome ſaid, that the point, that Chriſt offered himſelf in the Supper, was not lawfully decided, becauſe it had 23 contradictors:* [But, *Pallavicine* (*l.* 18. *c.* 9. *n.* 9.) ſhews, *Soave* to be miſtaken in this inſtance, this point having had only two contradictors, as appears in the Acts of the Council]. And obſerve again, what *Soave* very often inculcateth; That it was the cuſtome in this Council, to mould and change the Articles, and matter of their Decrees, till there was nothing contained in them, that diſpleaſed any conſiderable party. So he ſaith, p. 215. *That* Sta. Croce *the Legate, took incredible pains, in avoiding to inſert any thing in the Decrees, controverted among the Schoolmen; and in ſo handling thoſe, which could not be omitted, as that every one might be contented; In every Congregation obſerved what was diſliked by any, and took it away, or corrected it, as he was adviſed.* Now, what is this, but to ſay: that all, or almoſt all, were pleaſed with whatever was paſſed or voted, ſince he ſaith, that whatever diſpleaſed, was taken away; and that the *Proponents* did not force the Council to their propoſitions; but fitted their propoſitions to the mind of the Council: and then I ask, What violence or indirect means needed here to be uſed, to overbear a party?

§. 149. To this uſual conduct of the Council, all the exception that can be taken is; that, thus, it hath left *many* controverſies *undecided*. To which may be

be replied. 1. That, if the *Proteſtant* may Judge, the *Council*'s greateſt fault was in making ſo many deciſions; not, in making no more: and ſee *Soave* elſewhere cenſuring the Council on this ſide, p. 227. and 228. where he makes ſome to ſay, ——*That in all the Councils held in the Church from the Apoſtle's time till then, there were never ſo many Articles decided, as in one Seſſion only of* Trent [*viz.* the ſixth *Seſſion*]. And p. 822. ——*that in this Council matters were minced; and an Article of faith made of every queſtion which could be moved in any matter.* (Yet (*Ibid.*) are the ſame people angry; That in *Purgatory*, *Invocation of Saints*, *Indulgences*, the Council was not more particular in her deciſions). Defining, or not defining, how ſhall the Council pleaſe him, or his counterfeit German *Chorus*? 2. That nothing more than this ſhewed the great wiſdome of the Council; which forbare ſuch *deciſions*, either when it eſteemed the controverſie ſubtile, nice, inconſiderable, and *needleſs* to be determined; or, very *difficult*, and doubtful, and not having ſufficient evidence from *Scriptures*, and former *Tradition*, to be determined: The Council for the things it ſtates depending more on *Church-Hiſtory*, than *Logick*. Nor hence may any, when the Council thought fit to expreſs ſomething only in *general* terms, juſtly charge the Council with *ambiguity*, or equivocation, becauſe it anſwers not in its decree to every queſtion propoſed; but rather commend it, for a judicious refuſal to decide ſuch matter more ſpecifically, for the reaſon mentioned above, that it might ſtand confirm'd with a more general Acceptation; whilſt, meanwhile, the more generical deciſion is not made in vain, theſe more univerſal terms deciding ſuch point againſt ſome other ſects of religion more groſly erring, when they do not decide it alſo for all parties of the Schools. And this, I think, may ſatisfie *Soave*'s ſad complaints concerning the contradictings of *Soto* and *Vega*, p. 216. ——and of *Soto* and *Catharinus*, p. 229. both perhaps faultily endeavouring to make the determination of the Council more *ſpecifical*, than it was, that ſo it might ſpeak on his ſide.

3ly. Obſerve; that there can be no juſt exceptions taken againſt the free proceedings of the Council for thoſe matters of controverſie decided in it, wherein the *Proteſtants* oppoſed the *Roman* Church, no violence, or tyranny, uſed, either by the *Pope* over the Council, or by a more powerful party in the Council over the reſt, in theſe points. Which appears by the great *unanimity* and concord of the *Tridentine* Fathers, even according to *Soave*'s relations, for that part of their *Decrees*, and Canons, wherein are condemned any of the *Proteſtant* tenents. To inſtance in ſome of the chief. See their unanimity, in what oppoſed the Proteſtants, *Concerning Original ſin*. *Soave*, p. 175. ——*No man reſiſted the condemnation of the* [Proteſtant] *Articles.* ——and p. 184. *In the Council there being no more difference amongſt the Fathers, concerning the things diſcuſſed*, &c. *Concerning Juſtification* (excepting the moſt difficult *Arminian*, and *Janſenian*, controverſies) *Soave*, p. 223. ——*The two next Congregations* (ſaith he) *were ſpent in reading again the decrees as well of faith, as of reformation: the which* (*ſome ſmall matters being corrected by the advice of thoſe, who were not preſent at the firſt*) *pleaſed them.*

§. 150. 3.

them all. Concerning the neceſſity of Confeſſion to the Prieſt of mortal ſins committed after *Baptiſme*; See *Soave*, *p.* 348. where no oppoſition at all was made amongſt them, to the 6, 7, and 8, Canons of the 14th *Seſſion*. *Concerning Tranſubſtantiation and Adoration of Chriſt in the Euchariſt*; ſee *Soave*, *p.* 324. and 326. where, in the ſecond and ſixth Canons of the 13th *Seſſion* none diſſented, and many deſired to have them more full and enlarged. *Concerning the Maſs, that it is a propitiatory Sacrifice*; There was no diſagreement neither amongſt the Divines, *Soave*, *p.* 544: nor amongſt the Prelats, *p.* 554. and 738. *Concerning the lawfulneſs, and ſufficiency, of communicating only in one kind:* and, that, under every kind, and every part of it ſeparated, all Chriſt is contained, ſee *Soave*, p. 324, 325. ——*Upon the* 8*th* [*Article*] (ſaith he) *all made uſe of long diſcourſes, though all to the ſame purpoſe. Their principal reaſons to condemn it were*, &c. —— *That as much is not contained under one ſpecies* [by concomitancy] *as under both, was thought to be heretical.* and p. 519. —— *They all agreed, that there was no neceſſity, or precept, of the Cup.* Though, this was not ſo unanimouſly agreed upon, and therefore left undecided, Whether ſome greater meaſure of grace was not received by communicating in both, than in one, kind. See *Pall. l.* 12. *c.* 2. —— and *l.* 17. *c.* 7. *n.* 10. Again, *Concerning the permiſſion of the uſe of the Cup*, when as the *Pope* and his Legats, upon the earneſt ſolicitation of the *Emperour*, and many other Princes, were all inclined to a diſcreet indulging thereof, yet the major part of the Council went againſt them for the negative. See *Soave*, p. 459, 519, 567. And chiefly the Biſhops of thoſe Countries, where were no *Proteſtants*, becauſe all the Council having agreed, that the *Cup* was not neceſſary, all *Chriſt* being in both the kinds, they imagined, that diverſities of rites in ſeveral Nations, eſpecially in the moſt principal ceremonies, would end in ſchiſme and hatred (*Soave*, p. 459). And with much ado was it procured at laſt, that the judgment of this *permiſſion* ſhould be remitted to the *Pope*; but this, without any *recommendation* to him at all (though by ſome deſired) of ſuch a permiſſion; and this remitting it to the *Pope* not conceded by all, or moſt, but only by ſo many, as made the major part: and therefore ſaith *Soave* (p. 576.) this conceſſion was put amongſt the Articles of Reformation. *Concerning the being of a Purgatory, the lawfulneſs of the Invocation of Saints, and Veneration of Images.* Soave, p. 799. *In matter of* Saints, *they eaſily agreed to condemn particularly all the opinions contrary to the uſes of the* Roman *Church*, and p. 803. ——*The Legats held a Congregation the next morning, in which the decrees of* Purgatory *and of the* Saints, *were read, and afterward the Reformation of Friers read, and all approved with very great brevity, and little contradiction.* See the ſame in *Pall. l.* 24. *c.* 5. *n.* 5. Concerning the Holy *Scriptures*, or the Divine Service not to be uſed in the vulgar tongue, I find nothing decreed in the Council, ſave only *concerning one part of the ſervice, the* Maſs: and of it only this Seſſ. 22. *c.* 8. —— *Viſum eſt Patribus, non expedire, ut vulgari paſſim linguâ Miſſa celebraretur. Quamobrem retento antiquo, & probato ritu*, &c. and *Can.* 9. —— *Si quis dixerit, linguâ tantùm vulgari Miſſam celebrari debere*, &c; *Anathema ſit.* [Where you may obſerve that *Soave*, (I am afraid)

to

to make these decrees of the Council the more odious; or to have something more to say against them, in relating the *one* Canon, leaves out *passim*: and in the other leaves out *tantum*, p. 573, 574.] And to these all unanimously consented (Ibid.) ——*The Fathers* (saith he) *assented to the decrees except only to that particular, that Christ did offer himself. Concerning Priest's non-marriage, and the universal capability of the gift of chastity, and lawfulness of the vow of continency*, the 9th Canon of the 24th *Session*, the words of which are these: *Si quis dixerit, Clericos in sacris ordinibus constitutos, vel Regulares, castitatem solemniter professos, posse matrimonium contrahere, contractumque validum esse, non obstante lege Ecclesiasticâ vel voto; --posseq; omnes contrahere matrimonium, qui non sentiunt se castitatis, etiamsi eam vouerint, habere donum, Anathema sit; cum Deus id rectè petentibus non deneget, nec patiatur nos supra id quod possumus tentari*]. This Canon, I say, was generally assented-to by all the Council. See Soave, p. 783. *The doctrine and the anathematisms of Matrimony were read, to which all consented.* and p. 747.——*The Article of the promotion of married persons to Holy-Orders being proposed, the Fathers did uniformly, and without difficulty, agree in the negative.* See likewise, p. 678, 679. *Concerning Episcopacy*: Any thing therein opposite to *Lutheranism*, as the *Superiority* of Bishops *to Priests*, &c, *Sess.* 23. *c.* 7, was unanimously defined. See *Soave*, p. 599, and 738.

Thus, you see, I have run through the chief differences; to add more it is easie, but needless; giving you in the close the general observation of *Soave* p. 230. *That, which hath been related* (saith he) *in this particular*, [the Controversy concerning the Certainty of Grace] *and perhaps did happen in many matters*, [*i. e.* the members of the Council to differ in their judgment] *occurred not in condemning the* Lutheran *opinions; where all did agree with an exquisite unity.* To which words may be added what Archbishop *Laud* confesseth, §. 27. *n.* 1. ——*That none had suffrage in the Council, but such as were professed enemies to all, that called for reformation.* Therefore no Bishops, that were present in that Council, (for all such had suffrages) but were enemies to all, that called for *reformation*. And, this being so, surely there needed to be used no *tyranny* over such persons for so much as concerned the *Protestant* controversies. What will be said here, I know not. Shall we pretend, that this unanimity of the Council against the *Lutheran* tenents, rose out of ignorance of the grounds of their doctrine? But they read their works, and diligently collected out of these what doctrines were fit to be condemned; which they could not do, without seeing also in them the *reasons* and *foundations* of such doctrines. Or, arose it out of fear, which some of the Council, well inclined, had of the rest? The Arbishop (§. 29. *n.* 4.) seems to say some such thing.—— *For ought* A. C. *knows, many might agree with the Protestants in heart, that in such a Council durst not open themselves.* But so, in the Council of *Nice*, for ought we know, many might agree with the *Arians*. How can we have any judgment or sentence from Councils, if we appeale from their mouths to their hearts, inscrutable by us? But, if the Arch-bishop's *many* were an inconsiderable part of the Council, then still it is confest, that the main body of the Council were against the *Protestants*; which we were here to demonstrate.

§. 151. *n.* 1.

ſtrate: If his *many* were a great and conſiderable part of the Council, ſo as the act of the reſt without them would have been invalid, then why they ſhould ſo fear, as not to open their mouth, I ſee not. Or, laſtly, aroſe it out of that *fear*, which all the *Council* had of the *Pope*? But then, why did they, in matters which more nearly concerned the *Pope*, ſo freely vote againſt what he, and what his Legates approved, even ſome of the *Italians* with the reſt?

‖ See below §. 153. 168.

‖ For, if there were twice ſo many *Italians* as others, a major part of the Council could not vote againſt the *Pope's* inclinations, without ſome of the *Italian* Biſhops concurring.

§. 151. n 2.

But, to diſpel clearly theſe doubts, you may underſtand, that the Biſhops voted nothing againſt the *Proteſtants*, in the chief points at leaſt, but what was their own *belief* and *practice* before they came to the Council; and what had been the practice and belief of many former ages, even the Reformed being Judges: And that the chief *Queſtion* to be decided in the Council, was; Whether ſuch, and ſuch practices *lawful*? viz. Whether *Communion in one kind only*: *Adoration of Chriſt's Corporal Preſence in the Euchariſt*; *Offering the Sacrifice of the Maſs*; *Veneration of Images*; *Prayer to Saints*; *Prayer for the Dead, as better able, thereby, in their preſent condition before the day of Judgment*; *Indulgences*; *Monaſtick Vows*; *enjoining Celibacy*; *enjoining Sacerdotal Confeſſion, in caſe of mortal ſin*; &c, be, *lawful*? And, ſeeing the chief Queſtion, thus, in oppoſition to the new *Lutheran* Doctrines, was; Whether theſe things lawful, which were then, and in many former generations (*Proteſtants* not denying it) daily practiſed, what need, of force, of new Mandats from *Rome*, of hiring Suffrages, creating more, Titular, Biſhops, Oaths of ſtrict obedience to the *Pope*, ſuch a multitude of *Italians*, to procure a prevalent vote, or, to invite the Prelates in the *Council* to eſtabliſh thoſe things, ſeveral of which are found in their *Miſſals* and *Breviaries*. As: *the Sacrifice of the Maſs*; *Adoration of Chriſt's Body and Blood in the Euchariſt*, *Invocation of Saints*, *Prayer for the Dead*]. But yet, if theſe *Fathers* of the *Council* decided theſe things in ſuch a manner, by compulſion, how came both the *Catholick* Biſhops, in the *German Diets*, where free from ſuch *fears*, or *force*, in the time of the Council, to vote the ſame things, and alſo after the Council the many more *abſent* Fathers of the *Weſtern* Churches (and of *France* with the reſt) ſo freely, and voluntarily, to *accept* them, and to continue till their death in the conſtant obſervance of them.

But, if it be ſaid, that, though ſuch things were generally believ'd, and practiſed before, yet, by Art and violence, were now the Fathers brought to advance them into matters of *Faith*; I ask, concerning many of theſe Points, What *Faith* required, ſave of thoſe Truths, which are neceſſary to render them lawful, beneficial, *&c?* All practice lawful being grounded on ſome ſpeculative Propoſition, that muſt be true. Or, if more be required: yet more than this, *viz.* the *lawfulneſs* of ſuch practices, wherein theſe Fathers voluntarily concurr'd, was no way neceſſary for overthrowing the *Proteſtant's* contrary *Doctrine*.

§. 152.

4ly. Obſerve that no *violence* was uſed upon the Council for other points debated

debated between the *Catholicks* themſelves; *no violence*, ſo far, as that any thing favourable or advantageous to the *Pope* was at any time paſſed in the Council, when any ſmall number thereof oppoſed it: Concerning which *Pallavicino* in the cloſe of his Hiſtory, *l.* 24 *c.* 14 *n.* 9 hath theſe words.---*There was not in this Council eſtabliſhed, one point of faith, nor one Canon of diſcipline for the advantage of Popes; but, amonſt the ſecond* [the Canons of diſcipline] *very many, to their detriment, and of ſuch a thing indeed,* Soave *himſelf brings not ſo much as one example; ſo much is there wanting to him any ſign, or ſhadow thereof.* But, not to reſt in the teſtimony of a partiſan. The cheif points agitated in the Council, wherein the *Pope's* pre-eminence and priviledges are ſaid to be much concerned, were, beſides the matters of *Reformation*, theſe three-- 1. *Whether reſidency of Biſhops at their Biſhopricks, was* jure devino? which if eſtabliſhed, it was conceived, that it would take away from the *Pope* the power of giving Diſpenſations, Adminiſtrations, and Commendations, Pluralities, *&c.* by which, amonſt other things, the *Pope's* Attendents, and the dignity of his Court, would be much leſſened. See *Soave*, p. 647. 2 *Whether the Juriſdiction of Biſhops was* jure divino? which if eſtabliſhed, it was conceived, that it would infer, that the Keys were not given to *Peter* only; that all Biſhops were equal to the *Pope*; and the *Council* above him, *&c.* ſee *Soave*, p 609. 3. *Whether the Pope was ſuperior to Councils*; In never a one of which was any thing decreed on the *Pope's* ſide. 1. 2. 3.

1. Concerning *Reſidency* of *Biſhops*, it was not determined according to what was conceived to be the *Pope's* inclination; *viz.* that Reſidency was not *jure divino*; but, that which was determined (in, *Seſſ.* 23. *de reform. cap.* 1.) ſeemed rather to favour *jure divino*; upon a jealouſie of which (*Pallavicino l.* 21 *c.* 12 ſaith) ſome few excepted againſt the decree. Pope *Pius*, though he deſired the queſtion were omitted, yet ſhewed much moderation in it.--(*He did not condemn*, ſaith *Soave*, p. 503. *the opinion of thoſe who ſaid that Reſidency was* de jure divino, *yea he commended them for ſpeaking according to their conſcience; and ſometimes he added; that perhaps that opinion was the better.*) and ordered, that the Council might have its free courſe in it. As you may ſee in *Pall. l.* 24. *c.* 14. *n.* 11. and *l.* 16. *c.* 7. *n* 19. (where he quotes the *French* Embaſſador's teſtimony) and partly, in *Soave*, p. 504, 505. where he ſaith,--*That the Pope having well diſcuſſed the reaſons* [concerning *Reſidency*] *ſettled his opinion to approve it, and cauſe it to be executed, upon what law ſoever it were grounded, whether* Canonical *or* Evangelical. And two of his Legats were thought to favour the determining of it, *jure divino* ‖: and when it was put to the vote; whether this controverſie ſhould be ſtated by the Council or no; a major part were for the *affirmative* (*Soave*, p. 496) which, being ſuppoſed contrary to the *Pope's* deſire, ſhews, that, amonſt the reſt, ſome *Italians* alſo (who made the greater part of the Council) took liberty to relinquiſh his intereſt. Though, in fine, this point [whether *jure divino*] was left undecided, becauſe taking in thoſe, who referred to the *Pope*, almoſt an equal part (as *Soave*; but *Pallavicino* ‖ correcting him, ſaith, a major part) drew the contrary way; and to what elſe was ſtated about reſidence (*Seſſ.* 23. *Reform. cap.* 1.) In the *Seſſion* all agreed, ſave only eleven. §. 152. 1.

‖ *Pall. l.* 24. *c* 14 -*Soave* p. 496, 623.

‖ *l.* 16. *c.* 4. *n.* 21.

See *Pall. l.* 21. *c.* 12. *n.* 9.--and *Soave*, p. 742. And, in the General Con-
†*p.* 737--& gregation held before the *Seſſion*, all, ſave 28, ſaith *Soave*, † *i. e.* ſome of
Pallav. l. 21. the *Spaniſh* Biſhops.

c. 11. *n.* 4. §. 154. 2. 2. Concerning *Epiſcopacy jure divino* [of which the 6. *Can. de Sacram. Ordinis, Seſſ.* 23. ſpeaks thus.---*Si Quis dixerit, in Eccleſiâ Catholicâ non eſſe Hierarchiam divinâ ordinatione inſtitutam, quæ conſtat ex Epiſcopis, Presbyteris, & Miniſtris, Anathema ſit*; where the *Spaniſh* Biſhops would have had, *Divinâ Ordinatione*, changed into, *per inſtitutionem Chriſti.*] The great diſpute in the Council was not whether the *Order* of *Biſhops*, as ſuperior to *Prieſts*, and as including the power of *ordination* and *confirmation*; but whether the *Juriſdiction* of all *Biſhops*, eſpecially as to ſome points thereof, was *jure divino*, [*viz.* as to the *juſt extent*, and ſubject matter, of ſuch Juriſdiction, and the exterior and *forenſick* exerciſe thereof, wherein ſome *Biſhops* enjoys a much larger power, and compaſs; which extent of power ſeems to depend on *ſuperiors*, (as doth alſo the exerciſe of *Abſolution* in *Prieſts*) and is liable to be ſuſpended, taken away, transferr'd, diminiſhed: and this ne-
† See *Soave*, *p.* 623. 734. ceſſary, for avoiding confuſion. †] And here, as nothing was determined *againſt* the *Pope*, in this matter, ſo nothing *for* him. And, that no more in it ſhould be decided, then was decided, all the *Council* conſented in the *Seſſion*; and in the *Congregation*, held before it, all ſave the *Spaniſh* Biſhops; and therefore more conſented to this, than only the *Italians* and the *Pope's* party: ſee what *Soave* ſaith, *p.* 737, 738, 725, 735. where he relates,--*That the Cardinal of* Lorraine, *and the other* French *Prelats did not hold the Inſtitutions and ſuperiority of Biſhops*, de jure divino, *to be neceſſary to be determined in Council, but rather that it ought to be omitted.* Now though the *Pope* (if he had a major part of the Council on his ſide) could hinder the reſt for carrying any thing againſt him, by their votes, yet could he not over-aw the reſt, thus, to vote for him, who having much more dependence, for their Eſtates, on their Temporal, than their Spiritual, Supream, and backed by their Princes, and their Embaſſadors, in the Council (theſe alſo generall y much more favouring the *Biſhop's* than the *Pope's* rights) were ſecure enough againſt his power; even the *Italian* Prelats alſo, except that much ſmaller part of them, whoſe preferments lay in the *Pope's* Dominions.

§. 155 3. 3. Concerning the *Pope's Supremacy* in the Church, or *Superiority* to *Councils*, though the *Spaniards*, and all the reſt of the Council conſented, in as full terms, as the Council of *Florence* had expreſſed it, to decree, and inſert it in this Council alſo; and though only the *French Biſhops* who were not above the tenth part of the Council, reſiſted, yet the *Pope*, for peace ſake, becauſe there was not a full accord, ceaſed to proſecute the determination thereof; and the Article, drawn up was laid aſide. See theſe things more fully related in *Pallavicino's* Hiſtory, *l.* 19. and *l.* 24. *c.* 14. *n.* 12.
† *l.* 19. *c.* 15. *n.* 3. and ſee there † the contents of *Carlo Borromeo's* Letters to this purpoſe But the ſame thing, of the *Spaniſh* conſenting with the *Italians*, for declaring the Popes *authority* according to the *form* of the Council of *Florence*, appears in *Soave*, p. 737. 738. (though he much more compendious than

Pall.

Pallavicino in this part of the History, perhaps for want of intelligence; of which he complains in the beginning of his seventh book, p. 583.) And the same Author saith elsewhere, p. 732.--*That an order came from the* Emperour *to his Embassadors, to use all means, that the authority of the* Pope *should not be discussed in Council, because he saw the major part was inclin'd to enlarge it.* Yet, we see, the *Pope* did not prosecute such advantage. Neither doth that phrase accidentally used in *Sess.* 25. *R form.* 1. cap.---[*Sed & ad S. Romanæ Ecclesiæ Cardinales pertinere dicernet, quorum consilio apud Sanctum Romanum Pontificem cum universalis Ecclesiæ administratio nitatur,* &c. which the *French* Embassador *Ferrieres* so highly aggravated, 'that it yielded to the *Pope* superiority over *Councils* †] truly prove any such thing, neither passed it from the Council as any *Decree*; neither, in the reading (in the Congregation) of this, 1 *cap.* of *Reform.* wherein were some things corrected; did the *French Bishops* except at this, † which certainly they would have done, had they apprehended such danger in it. For also the *French* were not such opposites to the *Pope's* pre-eminency of authority, but that their Leader, the Cardinal of *Lorraine* proposed in the Council this Article for it (*Pallav l.* 19. *c* 6.) condemning any that should say;--*That* Peter, *by the institution of* Christ, *was not the Prime amongst the* Apostles, *and his supreme* Vicar.--*Or that it was not necessary, that there should be in the Church a chief Bishop,* Peter's *Successor, and equal to him, in the authority of Government; -and that his lawful Successors in the* See *of* Rome *have not the right of* Primacy *in the Church.* And the *French* Bishops, though they disallowed this form,--[*Datam esse à Concilio Pontifici Romano potestatem pascendi, & regendi Ecclesiam universalem*] because *Ecclesia universalis* here if taken *collectively,* would prejudice the *French* Church's opinion of the *Council's* superiority to the *Pope*: † yet they yielded to this form,--[*potestatem regendi omnes fideles, & omnes Ecclesias,--* or, *pascendi omnes Christi oves,*] if *omnes* be not taken *conjunctim* And for that supremacy of the *Pope* over the Church that is denied by Protestants, *Soave*, giving reasons, why *Henry* the 8th *prudently* declined a Council, thus secures this Supremacy Papal from any censure of the Bishops, saying, †--*That it was impossible, that a Council, composed of Ecclesiastical Persons, should not maintain this his power, which is the main pillar of their Order: Because this Order* (saith he) *by the* Papacy, *is above all* Kings *and the* Emperour; *but, without it, is subject to them there, being no Ecclesiastical Person that hath Superiority, but the* Pope. Thus he usually extracting the Original of all mens actions not out of Conscience, but Policy. Yet, in these points we see the *Pope's* supposed major party in the Council carried nothing for his advantage. But, how much the former bounds of the Episcopal Authority were *enlarged* by several Decrees of this Council that were confirmed, and ratified by the *Pope*, wherein at least they are substituted his perpetual and standing *Delegates* for transacting many things of great consequence, formerly dispatched by Himself, and his Officers, See below, § 205, 211. *&c.*

† *Soave* p. 818.

† *Soave* p. 803.

† *Pall. l.* 19. *c.* 13. *n.* 6. *c.* 12. *n.* 11. *l.* 21. *c.* 14. *n* 12. *Soave* p 657. † p. 170.

Mean while, whether, or how much the *Pope* or his party, when stronger there, might be faulty, in *hindring* any points to be determined, which the

reſt of the *Fathers* in the *Council* deſired ſhould be ſo, I connot ſay; be cauſe I cannot Judge, whether ſuch things are neceſſary to be determined as ſome of the Council ſaid they were; a few: or better not, as others, the moſt. But, if the *Pope* be culpable, for having (abſtracting here from Pro-
§. 150 teſtant-Controverſies, as hath been ſhewed †) hindred by his *Italian* adherents ſomething, that otherwiſe would have *paſſed*, He ſeems to make an amends for it, in the not *paſſing* in Council ſeveral other matters, which would have ſerved much for his advantage, when but a few ſeem'd diſcontented therewith.

§. 156. But, in the next place, let us now ſuppoſe, that, the Council un-oppreſſed, the contrary party there had carried all theſe points againſt the *Pope*, there could have followed, that I diſcern, no ſuch great advantage to *Proteſtantiſme* thereby, as ſome boaſt of. You may ſee the *conſequences*, endamaging the *Pope* ſet down by *Soave*, p. 609, 645. ſome of which are of no great moment, and others not truly conſequent. Certainly the Biſhops, who contended for their Juriſdiction, *jure divino*, intended no ſuch thing, as to equal, every one himſelf with the *Pope* in the Government of the Church; or to overthrow thereby, * the former Church-diſcipline; *the pre-eminent authority of *Primats*, and *Patriarchs*, conceded by former Councils; and * all the *jus Eccleſiaſticum*. This may be ſeen in their argumentations; wherein ſome pleaded a Juriſdiction belonging to all Biſhops, *jure divino*, and received immediatly from Chriſt, but this not *equal* with the *Popes*; others, their Juriſdiction received *jure divino*, but the *uſe*, application, and matter thereof received from the *Pope* (*Soave*, *p.* 597, 607, 618. 637.—*Pall. l.* 19. *c* 6. *n.* 3.) The *French* allowing from *Chriſt* the *Pop's* ſuperiority, as was ſhewed but now; †
§. 155. only confining his authority within the Canons (*Soave*, *p.* 640.): and the *Spaniards*, who moſt ſtickled for *Epiſcopal* Juriſdiction, *jure divino*, yet willingly conceding to the *Pope* all the power, that was acknowledged by the Council of *Florence*, and deſiring that both theſe might be eſtabliſhed together, as hath been ſhewed above; inſomnch, as *Pall. l.* 19. *c.* 6. *n.* 6. ſaith,—*It ſeemed to ſome, that the contention was reduced to meer words; whilſt the one would have the Juriſdiction of* Biſhops *to be immediatly from the* Pope; *the others, from* Chriſt; *yet ſo that the uſe and matter of ſuch Juriſdiction depended on the* Pope. And therefore I ſee no weight in thoſe words of *B. Bramhal* (*Schiſ. guarded*, 10. *Sect. p.* 474) who to *S. W's.* asking, whether, if the *Catholick* Biſhops out their Provinces had been preſent in the Council to counterpoiſe the *Italians*, he would pretend, that they would have voted againſt their Fellow-Catholicks in behalf of *Luther*, and *Calvin*, anſwereth thus,—*I ſee clearly, that if the* Biſhops *of other Countrys had been proportioned to thoſe of* Italy, *they had carried the debate about Reſidence* [yet is not Reſidence even amongſt *Proteſtants* voted, *jure divino*.] *and the divine Right of* Epiſcopacy; *and that had done the buſines of the* Weſtern *Church, and undone the Court of* Rome. *Done the buſineſs of the* Weſtern *Church*? what meaneth he? So, as the *Pope* would have ceaſed to have had any Supremacy over them? why, thoſe alſo allow and ſubmit to it, who ſtill hold *Epiſcopal* Juriſdiction, *jure divino*; as none in the *Roman* Church are obliged to hold the contrary. But, ſuppoſe the *Pope*

diſarmed

disarmed of Supremacy, are thus all the other *main differences* in point of faith, between *Protestants*, and these *Western* Bishops, stated on the *Protestant* side? Or, will the Reformed now declare them controversies of small moment, (as Bishop *Bramhal* in a vehement assaulting of the Court of *Rome*, seems to relaxe other quarrels with that Church) and yield them to their Adversaries? But, had any the art first to accord these speculative points of difference, which the *Protestants* have with the *Western* Churches, he need not fear, that the *Pop's supremacy* could put any bar between the two Religions. Which *Supremacy* those *Catholick* Bishops, or Churches, that do most abridge, and have their free liberty to maintain; what in the Council they would have voted, concerning this matter, do yet continue in the other points as violent, and stiff, against the *Reformed*, as any.

5. Thus much of the *Pop's*, and Council's proceedings in those three great points of contention. Next, concerning the *Pop's* carriage toward the Council for other matters of *Reformation*, wherein he is so much accused to have made unjust obstructions; *Pallavicino*, in vindication of *Pius* the 4th. in whose times these Reformations were most agitated, and proceeded in, hath these words (*l.* 24 *c.* 12. *n.* 13.) --- *Pius the 4th frequently enjoined his Legats, that a Reformation should be made of his Court, and of his Tribunals* [and especially of the *Cardinals*, which reformation he attempting first at *Rome* in vain, remitted it the more earnestly to the Council, as may be seen in *Caw: Borromeo's* letters. *Pall. l.* 22 *c.*1. *n* 5.--- *l.* 21. *c.*6 *n* 6,7.] *without acquainting him first with it; frequently grieved and complained that it was not done; commended whatever was determined in the* Sessions *concerning it, though unlooked for, contrary to his expectation, and most damageful to his Treasury, and to his Court.* Which words of his are verified, both by the frequent Letters to this purpose written to the Council by *Carlo Borromeo*, according to the *Pop's* order, † which you may read at your leasure: and by the testimony of *Lorraine*, and others in the Council. And indeed how could this be otherwise? since *Carlo Borromeo*, that holy man, (was his chief Adviser, and his chief *Minister*, to the Council in this, and all other affairs, who was himself one of the severest *Reformers* (yet not besides the *Canons*) that ever the Church of Christ hath known, as the history of his life, written by *Giussano*, sheweth. §. 157. 51. † Apud *Pallav. l.* 20. *c.*5. *n.* 5.--*l.* 21. *c.* 6. *n.* 1, 2, 6. 7.-*l.* 22. *c.* 1. *n*, 5, 12, 13

And, that actually, by this *Council*, a great and severe reformation was decreed, the *Court* of *Rome* much rectified, the *Pop's* Revenue much diminished, the *Jurisdiction* of Bishops (whether held *immediatly*, or *mediatly*, from Christ, here it matters *not*) much enlarged, *Residency* of Bishops (whether it be *jure Divino*, or *Ecclesiastico*) strictly enjoined; former Dispensations and Appeals much restrained, I refer you * to what the *Articles* themselves especially in the five last *Sessions* under *Pius*, make appear; and to what is said below in the fifth *Head* † concerning them; and * to the testimony of the *French Bishops*, set down above, §. 77. with whom it was a chief motive, to request of the King the accepting this Council, because the *French* Church stood in so much need of the *reformations established therein*; §. 158. §. 207.

than which (ſay they) *they could find none more auſtere and rigorous; nor more proper for the preſent malady, and indiſpoſition of all the members of the Body Eccleſiaſtical*: and * to the teſtimony of *Soave* himſelf recited above, §. 124. and below, §. 204 touching the heavy complaint of the *Roman* Court, concerning this *reformation*, and their endeavours with the *Pope* to hinder, for this cauſe, the *reformation* of the *Council*. If its laws are not, ſince, every where ſo well obſerved, I deſire that the Council, or the then *Pope* may not be indicted for this fault. Neither are we (for trying the benefit of that Council) ſo much to examine, whether there be not ſtill ſome diſtempers left unprovided therein of a cure; as, whether *many* which were before, are not remedied thereby; and whether the times preceding this Council were not much *more* depraved, than the preſent. Which I think you will not doubt of, if you read, both in the narrations of *Catholicks* and *Proteſtants*, the groſs *corruptions* of thoſe days. So that I may ſay, the unhappy reformation from that Church occaſioned a happy one *in* it; and a ſchiſm, by Divine Providence bringing good out of evil, ſerved much to purifie the *Catholick* Religion. But of this Reformation, as to the particulars; I ſhall ſpeak more fully in the fifth *Head*, §. 203. &c.

CHAP. X.

§. *That no violence was inferred upon the liberty if the Council, as to the defining any thing therein contrary to the General Approbation,*

By,

1. *The* Pop's *Legats propoſing the things to be handled there*, §. 160.
2. *The Conſultation made, in every thing, with the* Pope, §. 164.
3. *The exceſſive number of* Italian *Biſhops*, §. 167. *And the not voting by* Nations, *but the preſent Prelats*, §. 169.
4. *The* Pop's *giving Penſion*, §. 170.
5. *And admitting* Titular *Biſhops*, §. 171.
6. *The Prohibition of Biſhop's* Proxies *to give Definitive votes*, §. 172.

§ 159. 6. NEither ſeem thoſe things, which are ſo frequently objected, * to infer any violence, or make any treſpaſs, as they were uſed, upon the liberty of the Council, as to the defining any thing therein contrary to its general Approbation; or, * to be, in themſelves, unjuſtifiable.

1. Namely theſe, 1. The *Popes Legat's propoſing* in publick the things to be handled in the Council.

2. 2. Their *conſulting* in all matters, and receiving directions from, the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, and his entertaining alſo a *Council* at *Rome* to adviſe with.

3. 3. The preſence in the Council of ſuch a *multitude* of *Italian* Biſhops; and the voting there not according to the plurality of

4. *Nations*, but of their Repreſentatives preſent in the Council. 4. The

Pop's

Pop's giving monthly *pensions* to several Bishops. 5. Admitting *titular* ones in the Conncil. 6. The prohibition of Bishop's *proxies* to give *definitive* votes. 5. 6. §. 160.

To the first: The Pop's *Legat's proposing* the things to be handled there. 1. For the lawfulness, and necessity, of certain persons to direct, what *things* shall be handled, what *order* in them observed, *&c.* in such great Assemblies, I desire you to read *Soave's* discourse, *p.* 135. where speaking of Councils, he goes on thus,---*After a certain time, passions of men and charity being mingled together, and their being a necessity to govern them with some order, the cheifest man, amongst those that were assembled in the Council, either for learning, or for greatness of the City, or Church, whereof he was,* &c. *took upon him the charge to* propose, *and guide the action, and collect the voices.--- After that it pleased God to give peace to Christians,* &c. *the action was guided by those Princes which did call them together; proposing, and governing the treaty and decreeing, interlocutorily, the occurring differences; but leaving the decision of the principal point, for which the Council was congregated, to the common opinion of the assembly* [as also it cannot be denied the Legat's did, themselves giving their vote last†]. *This was done* * *in the first Council of* Ephesus *before the Earl* Candidianus *sent President by the* Emperour; *and more clearly* * *in that of* Chalcedon *before* Marcianus, *and the Judges by him appointed;* * *in that of* Constantinople *in* Trullo, *before* Constantine Pogonatus; *where the Prince, or Majestrate that was President, commanded what should be handled, what order observed, who should speak, and who be silent* [so much not practised in the Council of *Trent*, *and so did decide, and accommodate the differences in those things.* Yet closer, *p.* 330 — *The judgment of the Church,* saith he, (*as was necessary in every multitude*) *was fit, that it should be conducted by one, who should preside and guide the actions, purpose the matter, and collect the points to be consulted on. This care, due to the most principal, and worthy person, was alwaies committed to the Bishop* [and then by consequence in a multitude of prelats, to the most Principal Bishop among them.] Thus *Soave.* In this matter therefore you see the same things were done in former Councils, as in *Trent*; and when this done by a Bishop, the doing justified; can the same practice, then, in both leave those Councils free, and render this Enslaved? To 1. *Soave*, 138.

2. After this of *Soave*, see the *Popes* defence, in his Letters written to the *Emperour*, and King of *Spain*, upon their complaint of it. *Apud Pallav. l.* 20. *c.* 8, *n.* 10. *n.* 17.— *That the words* [proponentibus Legatis] *were composed by the synod it self without his knowledge; approved first unanimously in a general congregation; and afterwards in the first Session* †[*i. e.* under *Pius*, which is the 17.th *Session* of the Council] *with the opposition of two only* [*Soave* saith of four; two more desiring a qualification of it.] *That, since Princes desired the Council's freedom from this, he was content it should be so: though he well foresaw the unbridled licentiousness that would come thereof.* See the Legat's defence likewise, in answer to the King of *Spain*: *Pall. l.* 16. *c.* 6. *n.* 5.— and *Pallavicino's*, in answer to *Soave*— *l.* 23. *c.* 12. *n.* 7. Lastly, if you desire more satisfaction, see the unanimous explication of this clause, *proponentibus* §. 161. †*Sess* 17 *De ere de Cele brand. Conn*

bus legatis, both by the Legats, and Council (importun'd thereto by the King of *Spain's* Letters, to whom the Propoſals of *Princes* to the Council, as well as of other *Prelats* in it, ſeemed by this clauſe to receive ſome obſtruction) *Seſſ. 24. c. 21. de Reform.* —*S. Synodum explicando declarare, mentis ſuæ non fuiſſe, ut in prædictis verbis ſolita ratio tractandi negocia in Generalibus Conciliis ullâ ex parte immutaretur; neq; novi quidquam, præter id, quod ſacris canonibus, vel generalium Synodorum formâ hactenus ſtatutum eſt, cuiquam adderetur, vel*
p. 781. *detraheretur.* By which Declaration (ſaith *Soave* †) that difficulty, ſo much agitated, received an end, with ſatisfaction of all. And a Comment on this Decree may be the free practiſe of the fathers of this council, and alſo of the Agents of Princes, not leſs after it, than before it.

§. 162. 3. Again. Though the *propoſal* of matters to be conſidered in the Council were neceſſary for order-ſake to be committed to the care, and ſuper-intendence of ſome particular members; (and of whom rather, than the *more dignified?*) yet it may be obſerved, through *Soave's* whole relation of the actions of this council; that no matter, whereof the propoſal was deſired, or proſecuted by the *major*, or a *conſiderable*, part of the Biſhops (unleſs, perhaps, the Council's proceeding in the reformation of Secular *Princes*, the Articles whereof are ſet down in *Soave*, p. 760, which, though advanced
†See *Soave*, p760, 766, 767. by the *Clergy*, all the Embaſſadours, and Orators unanimouſly oppoſed †) was ſtoped by the Legat's *power* (though I grant, ſeveral times diverted, or diſſuaded, by their *advice*,) and that propoſals alſo were not uſally made in the Council by others (if we may *believe Soave*); propoſals both moſt contrary to the *Pope's* intereſt, and moſt diſpleaſing to his Legats. To name ſome; Such were, * thoſe concerning the two great queſtions about the *Inſtitution*, and *reſidency of Biſhops*; whether *jure divino*. * Articles of Reformation to be joyned, in their conſultations, with thoſe of Doctrine and Religion. * The abrogating, or moderating, of the priviledges, and exemptions of *Regulars*, from the Epiſcopal power; * the abrogation, or moderating of Commendams, Diſpenſations, Union of benefices; —Of penſions, and reſervations of profits, out of Eccleſiaſtical Benefices: * Ordination of Titular Biſhops. —*Appeales* to the *Pope*; * The Council's repreſenting the *Univerſal* Church. All which, and many more were agitated in the Council, the Legats (as *Soave* repreſents them) reluctating: yet, not offering to infringe the liberty of the Council, where *they* ſaw the inclinations of a conſiderable part bent that way.

* p. 192. So, *concerning reſidency, and exemptions*, *Soave* * tells us (the truth of the Hiſtory frequently conſtraining him to contradict thoſe maximes, which are elſewere laid down by him, to infer the ſlavery of the council:) — *That the Legats were Enforced to conſent that both ſhould be conſidered of, and that every one ſpeak his opinion of them, and that ſome Fathers ſhould be deputed to frame the Decree, that it might be examined.* Concerning the *Articles handling Reformation*, p. 144, 145. he ſaith: *The number contending for them was ſo great, that the Legats were confounded. And that they yielded to their deſire, being conſtrained thereunto by meer neceſſity.* Concerning *abrogating the exemption of Regulars*, p. 761, and, 167, 170, he ſaith *It was a thing moved by the Biſhops: — and*

that

that this Opinion being embraced first by the Germans, *then by the* Spaniſh *Prelates, and at laſt ſomewhat coldly by the* Italian, *the Legate remained immoveable; and ſhewed plainly, that he ſtood quiet, being forced by neceſſity.* And concerning *the Reformation of Princes*, p. 769, he ſaith, --- *That the Legates gave forth this Article being forced thereunto by the mutiny of the Prelates.* If you would ſee more inſtances in *Soave* of the Council's bridling, and over-ruling the Legates, I refer you to *Quorlius*, *l.* 2. Firſt and Second *Chapters*, a diligent Collector of them. So, *p.* 656. concerning the ſeveral *Articles* of *Reformation* preſented by the *Emperor*, and by the *French*, † which were thought to intrench too much upon the *Pope*'s Priviledges; *Soave* brings him in giving ſuch inſtructions to his Legates: ----*That they ſhould defer to ſpeak of them, as long as was poſſible*; ----*That, when there was neceſſity to peruſe them, they ſhould begin with thoſe that were leaſt prejudicial*, &c. ---- *That, in caſe they were forced to propoſe them, imparting their Objections to the Prelates their adherents, they ſhould put them in diſcuſſion, and controverſie.* So, very frequently in his Hiſtory, you ſhall find him (as if he had forgot himſelf, concerning what he affirms elſewhere of the *domineering*, and *tyranny* of the *Pope*, and his party) revealing the diſtractions, the fears, the complaints, and upon this, the ſubtile Artifices of the *Pope*, and of his Legates, (probably, ſuch as his own wit could contrive, who with his fancy preſumes to enter into all their ſecrets, and ſpeaks as if he had the Art of diſcerning *Thoughts* and *Intentions* as clearly, as others do *Actions* and *Records*) and many times, as you have ſeen, after all theſe, he repreſents the Legates yielding, and going along with the ſtream, becauſe they could with no Art withſtand it. But, if indeed the *proponentibus Legatis*, was intended, or executed in ſuch a manner, as *Proteſtants* affirm, ſo as that nothing could be moved in the Council, but what they pleaſed, though a major part deſiring it; nor any thing pleaſed them, that it ſhould be moved, which was prejudicial to the *Pope*'s Intereſt, or Grandeur; this ſurely would have remedied, and prevented all theſe fears, and jealouſies of the *Pope*, and *Court* of *Rome*; ſuppoſing his Legates, as *Soave* always repreſents them, ſtill true and faithful to him. ⌋ But I ask, What matter of moment was there, how much ſoever diſtaſtful to the *Pope*, or *Court* of *Rome*, that, being preſented once in *Trent*, was ſtrangled, before it came to be propoſed, and agitated in the *Council?* The *Articles* of *Reformation*, that were exhibited by the *Imperial* and *French* Ambaſſadors, were, after ſome delay, taken into conſideration in the 24*th.* and 25*th. Seſſions.* † And here, when ſome Ambaſſadors propoſed, that *Deputies* might be elected for each *Nation*, to take care in the Council, of the ſpecial intereſt of it, ---- *The Cardinal of* Lorrain, *and the other Ambaſſadors, both the* French *and* Emperor's, *contradicted it* (ſaith *Soave*) *alledging that every one* [*i. e.* in the Council] *might ſpeak his opinion concerning the Articles propoſed; and propoſe others, if there were cauſe; ſo that there was no need to give this diſtaſt to the* Pope, *and the Legates.* Such a Liberty, then, *de facto*, there was uſed in the Council: But, I ſay not, whether always with that diſcretion that was needful; or, whether not with ſome Contradiction of ſome perſons of a ſounder judgment than the reſt. Or, whether the *Legates* did not well, in putting ſuch

† *Soave*, p. 513, 652.

† *Soave*, p. 751, 759.

bounds to this liberty, as they well could, either by uſing *perſwaſions* to the contrary, or by interpoſing *delays*, till the firſt fervour was a litle cooled, as to many points which they ſaw *unprofitable*, difficult, and apt to divide the Council into *Parties*, and not tending to thoſe ends, for which this *Council* was chiefly Aſſembled: Eſpecially, whilſt they endeavoured to win the reluctting party, though this were not very numerous, with *reaſon* and *treating*, rather than *force* or *over-voting* them in Council.

§. 163. 4*ly*. Such a ſole priviledge of *propoſal*, to be appropriated to the Legates of the *Apoſtolick See*, further than for order ſake, ſeems needleſs to be contended for: For, if (as *Soave* often ſaith) the major part of the Council, being *Italians*, were at the Pope's devotion for deciding all matters, what mattered it, who, or what was, propoſed?

5*ly*. You may obſerve; That no ſuch preſcription, as *proponentibus Legatis*, was made to the *Council*'s proceedings, till *Pius* his time; and yet that all things, there, run in the ſame courſe before, as after it: Neither do any *Proteſtants* eſteem the Council more free, or equitable unto them, under *Paul*'s, or *Julius*'s, than under *Pius*'s Conduct.

6. *Laſtly*, Which muſt be often ſaid; as to the moſt, or all the *Proteſtant* Controverſies concerning *Doctrine*, the *Legate*'s propoſal could be no diſadvantage; in condemning which Doctrines the whole *Council* hath been †§. 150. ſhewed † to be ſo unanimous.

§. 164. To 2. To the *Second*. The *Conſultation* in every thing made with the Pope.

1. 1. Whereas it is uſually urged by *Proteſtants*, out of *Soave*, * That, as none could propoſe any thing in the *Council* ſave the *Legates*, ſo the *Legates* might propoſe nothing, till they had received a *Commiſſion* from *Rome* —— *That nothing was reſolved by the Fathers, but all in* Rome; *and the Council guided by the* Holy Ghoſt, *ſent thither from time to time in a Cloak-bag from* Rome, † much more is charged, than is true. For, a propoſal of the matters, from time to time to be *diſcuſſed* in Council, was made, and digeſted in *Trent*, by a general agreement of the *Fathers*, unknown to the Pope, as appears throughout this Hiſtory. After which reſolved, 1. Some *Congregations* of *Divines* diſputed the point, and conſidered the matters propoſed, at which any of the *Fathers*, that would, might be preſent. 2. After this arguing, followed the Congregations of the *Prelates*, for *framing* the heads of *Doctrine*, and *Reformation*, according to the moſt common opinion. 3. Then a *General Congregation* of the ſame *Prelates*, for giving their *votes* concerning them; and, 4. *Laſtly*, The *Seſſion*; when they were voted again, and ſo publiſhed (See *Soave*, *p.* 167.) Now all or moſt part of theſe, ſaving the laſt (the *Seſſion*) were uſually paſſed without the Pope's knowledge, or concurrence; and the *Legates* themſelves are ſometimes found differing from one another in their votes: (as they were in that of *Reſidence*, *) at which time alſo ſome other Biſhops gave their Vote, with *reſervation* to conſulting of the Pope: which ſhews the Pope's mind (though in a matter ſo much concerning the *Apoſtolick See*) was not then known. But after theſe *General Congregations* was uſually notice of ſuch *Decree*, as was paſſed therein, ſent

* See *p.* 481, 507.

† *p.* 497.

* *Soave*, *p.* 518, & 496.

to

to *Rome*, before its being voted again, and publiſhed in the *General Seſſion*. And of this, a Charge is alſo given to his *Legates* by *Pope Paul* the Third, in *Soave*, *p.* 164. though I find not, that *Pius* required it: Nay, if we may believe this Hiſtorian, he ſeemeth in ſome Places to decline it (as appears in the Quotations here following): The *Decree*, thus ſent to *Rome*, was there alſo by the *Pope's Council* examined; and his Judgment returned to the *Legates*, concerning it: which, when differing from that of the *Council*, (which thing ſeldom happened, except in the Queſtions between the *Epiſcopal* and *Papal* Rights) the *Legates* endeavoured to procure by common Conſent either ſome *alterations*, or at leaſt, an *omiſſion* of ſuch Decree, in the following *Seſſion*; but this with all Freedom of the *Council* ſtill obſerved, (a good Part of whom was alſo ſtill animated againſt the *Pope*'s Intereſts, by the Ambaſſadors of Secular *Princes*) nothing being done againſt the Satisfaction of any conſiderable Part of the *Council*; the uttermoſt of the *Legate's* Attempts, then, extended to procure an *omiſſion* of that; to which the *Pope* would not conſent; not any *determining* of what he approved, when thereby was feared the Alienating of ſome *Nation* from the *Roman Faith*; and if, thus, ſomthing was hindred, by their Intermiſe, from being paſſed by the *Council*, which otherwiſe would have been ſo; yet nothing was advanced to be paſſed, which otherwiſe would not have been: and ſo the Conciliary Acts have ſuffered no prejudice by it: Nor any hurt done, ſave that thus Men are left to their former *Liberty* ſtill in ſome Points, wherein the *Council* would have reſtrained it; a thing, I hope, the *Reformed* will not complain of. You may, at your leiſure, particularly view in *Soave* the Liberty the *Council* took to examine the *Pope*'s Propoſals, in the *Inſtitutions* of *Biſhops*, and *Papal Supremacy*; and the Alterations, which were made in them. † *p.* 657, & 723.

§. 165. 2.

2. In the next place, I will give you the *Pope*'s Plea for himſelf, againſt thoſe who accuſed him for thus abbridging the *Freedom* of the Council. To this matter, then, friendly complained of by the *Emperor* in a Letter to him, thus anſwered *Pius* the 4*th*. in another, (See *Pall. l.* 20. *c.* 8. *n.* 7.) *-----That he never gave any ſuch Command, as that nothing ſhould be decreed in the Council, without conſulting him firſt. That, in things more difficult, the Legates demanded his Advice; nor could, or ought, he to deny it them. That it croſſed not their Liberty, was not undecent, or unuſual; that the Council it ſelf ſhould deſire the Judgment of the* Apoſtolick See.*----Nor was it unfitting, that the* Pope, *being to give Counſel to his Legates, ſhould firſt take it with the* Cardinals, *Men of great Judgment, and Learning; eſpecially, he not intending, that his Advices ſhould impoſe any neceſſity on the Council to follow them.* Thus *Pius*; methinks, with much Reaſon. And it is manifeſt, that the *Council* in many things did not follow them. And though litle was decreed by the *Council*, againſt that which came from *Rome*; yet both all, that came from *Rome*, was not decreed; and much decreed, that came not from *Rome*; the *Pope* often deſiring them, eſpecially for *Reformations*, to proceed without conſulting him: And (in *Soave*, *p.* 503.) *complaining to his* Cardinals *of thoſe* [in the Council] *who referred themſelves unto him: Becauſe* (ſaith he) *the Council was*

Aſſembled, that every one may deliver his own Opinion, and not lay the things of difficulty upon the back of another, [*i. e.* the Pope] *that themſelves might avoid*
† *p.* 723. *Hatred, and Envy.* As alſo, the ſame Author † relates; That, his Legates ſending to *Rome* the *Articles*, that were drawn up in the Council, of the *Inſtitution*, and *reſidence* of *Biſhops*, the *Pope* reprehended the *Legates* for ſending them:----*Becauſe he knew, that the Major Part in the Council were good* Catholicks, *and devoted to the Church of* Rome; *and in confidence hereof he was content, that the Propoſition, and Reſolution ſhould be determined in* Trent,
† *p.* 684. *without his Knowledge.* The ſame Author † makes him further, in defence of his *Inſtructions*, from time to time ſent to his *Legates*, and to the *Council*, anſwering the ſame Letter of the *Emperor*, on this manner; plauſibly enough, though as *Pallavicino* taxeth him, miſrelating in ſeveral things the
† *l.* 20. *c.* 8. *n.* 9. Contents of the *Letter*: †----*That no Council was ever celebrated in the Abſence of the* Pope, *but that he hath ſent Inſtructions; which the Fathers have alſo followed: That the Inſtructions do ſtill remain, which Pope* Celeſtine *ſent to the Epheſine Council; Pope* Leo, *to that of* Chalcedon; *Pope* Agatho, *to that in* Trullo; *Pope* Adrian *the Firſt, to the Second of* Nice; *Pope* Adrian *the Second, to the Eighth* General Council *of* Conſtantinople. And, thus alſo he makes
† *p.* 503. him to plead his Cauſe at *Rome*, before the Cardinals: †----*That he could not chuſe but be troubled with that which was ſpoken concerning the Liberty of the Council; and that, to conſult of the Matters at* Rome, *was to violate it: Saying, That it was a ſtrange thing, that he, who was* Head *of the* Church, *and the* Cardinals, *who were principal Members, and the other Prelates in* Rome, *who have Voice in the* Council, *ſhould be accounted Strangers, and might not be informed of what is handled therein, and ſpeak their Opinion; when as thoſe, who have no lawful part in it, hold it lawful to intermeddle, and that in an ill ſort. That it is plain, that the* Prelates *went to* Trent, *with Commiſſion from their* Princes, *according to which they proceed: And that the Ambaſſadors by Letters, and Perſwaſions, do compel them to follow the Intereſt of their Maſters: And yet for all this, no Man ſaith, (which ſhould be ſaid) that the* Council *is not free.* Thus *Pius* in the Conſiſtory. And indeed, had not only the *Pope*, but alſo *all* the abſent *Biſhops* in the World aſſembled a *Council* of their *Clergy*, and ſent their *Judgment* from time to time to *Trent*, (ſo long as the *Council* was not obliged to follow it) this would have brought no Subjection, or Diſhonor, but have added more Reverence, to its Decrees, enacted after they had firſt been ſifted by ſo many ſeveral Examinations. Nor do I ſee, how the *Popes*, *Paul* or *Pius*, their *Conſultations* with their Council of *Biſhops* at *Rome* before every *Seſſion* of *Trent*, concerning the Points to be determined therein; and upon it, declaring their Judgment to the *Legates*, or to the *Council*, (provided they uſe no unlawful Practiſes for the corrupting of any one's Judgment) ſhould be more thought to preſcribe to, or to diminiſh the Freedom thereof, than the precedent *Conſultations* uſed antiently in *Provincial Councils*, concerning ſome Point afterward to be defined in a *General*, was held prejudicial to it: or, than Pope *Celeſtine*'s, or *Leo*'s precedent Letters to the Third and Fourth *General Council*, declaring their Judgment concerning what was to be diſcuſſed there, may be thought an unlawful Preſcription

tion to them; though the Hereticks, condemned by these *Councils*, excepted against it. And, *de facto*, what Secular *Prince* was there, whose Orators in the *Council* acquainted him not continually with the Actions thereof, and accordingly received new Instructions for their Negotiations?

To what hath been said, I have one thing more to add: That, as such a frequent Re-consulting the *Apostolick See* was unusual in many former *Councils*; so there was not thereof, in them, the same necessity: because such *Councils* being Assembled for the determining some one, or a few Points of Controversy, the *Pope*'s Legates received full Instructions concerning the Faith of the *Roman See* therein, before their first Coming: But in so many Controversies of all sorts, as here came to be agitated, it was impossible for that *Bishop*, either fully to pre-inform his *Missioners*, or to fore-see the *Questions*: As *Canus*, who was one of this *Council*, long since observed, in *Com. loci*, *l.* 5. *c.* 5. And if it be said, That the *Pope*'s Presence in the *Council* might have prevented all such trouble and offence, his Absence seems rather eligible for this, that so he might do all things with more *mature* Advice, and less Precipitancy, on whose Judgment the Affairs of the *Council* did chiefly depend: to which may be added, what himself urgeth to the *Emperor*; † that his *personal presence* there, then, would have seemed to tend much more to the over-awing and oppressing of the *Council's Liberty*. §. 166. † *Pallav.* l. 2. c. 8. n. 4.

To the *Third*. 1. The *great* number of *Italian Bishops*: And, 2. The not voting by *Nations*. Of the First of these; the thing being confessed, these things may be said: * That such a thing, without the *Pope*'s particular Design, would have happened; these *Bishops* being much nearer, than those of *Spain* and *France*; and not having the like Impediments, of *Lutheranism*, and *National Colloquies*, as the *Germans*: * That, suppose the *Pope* had sent them all, the Charitable may clearly see another Cause thereof, than only their driving there of the *Pope*'s Interest; namely, the sometimes great *scarcity* of *Bishops* in the *Council*; especially, at the first Opening of it. * That, if other *Bishops* were hindered to be present, the frequency of the *Italians*, how numerous soever, if of such as had lawful Suffrages, cannot be blamed, though the Absence of others be excused. * That, as the *Pope* was diligent to send in these; so he was very sollicitous, by writing to their *Princes*, to procure a fuller Representative from other *Nations*; as appears frequently in the History: And so also was the *Counsil* it self, (and the *Italians* therein) which *Council* also proceeded to lay heavy *Mulcts* upon the *Absents*, had not the Ambassadors interceded, and in part excused them. Of which see before, §. 71. * That, though the *Italian Bishops* in general are confessed to be inclined more than others, to maintain the *Pope*'s Honour, and Greatness; yet so many of them, as were not Beneficed in the *Pope*'s State, and subject to his Temporal Dominion, (which was very inconsiderable in respect of the rest of *Italy*) if we may believe *Soave*, were addicted much more to their own *Princes*, in things wherein their Ambassadors craved their Assistance, than to the *Pope*; as on which *Princes* they had a greater dependance, in respect of their Estates, their Parentage, *&c.* than on the *Pope*. §. 167. To 3.

Pope. Therefore, we find not only thoſe of the *Imperial*, or *Spaniſh* States of *Italy*, but the *Venetians*, and *Florentines*, in ſeveral things, to have divided from thoſe of the *Papacy*. See *Soave*, *p.* 504, 559, 558. *That nothing could be paſſed in the *Council*, as to matters of Doctrine, if a *conſiderable* Part contradicted, though a *Major* Part favoured it; and that the *non-Italians* were never but accounted (in reſpect of the Nations repreſented by them) a conſiderable Part; ſo that, to *hinder* ſomthing from being voted, ſuch a number of *Italians* was, or might be made uſe of; but to *Vote* any thing they alone, were eſteemed uneffectual; and the Omiſſions of the *Council* may be ſometimes charged upon them, but not the Acts. * That, whether the *Pope* had the Suffrages of the *Italian Biſhops* at his beck, or no, he had no need of any ſuch Aſſiſtance for the *Proteſtant-Controverſies*: In condemning of which, *Soave* confeſſeth the Votes of the whole *Council* to concur; as hath been ſhewed before, as to many Particulars, §. 150. and ſee *Soave*, *p.* 182, 183. ſaying, *That as to thoſe points, like a City beleaguered, the Factions among them ceaſed, and all joined againſt the common Enemy.*

§. 168. Laſtly, As to thoſe *Controverſies*, wherein the *Council* was more divided, and the Pope's *ſingle* Intereſts were not more nearly concerned: *That, *de facto*, he had no ſuch Aſſiſtance of the greateſt part of the *Italian Biſhops*; nor the *Major* Part of the *Council* at his Command, to Vote what he pleaſed. This alſo frequently appears from *Soave*'s own Relations. In theſe he makes often mention of the *Biſhops* of *Naples*, and *Lombardy* (the greateſt Part of *Italy*) their conforming to the *Emperor*, their Sovereign's Inclinations, and their being ſteered by his Ambaſſador; and ſpeaks ſeveral times of the *Imperial Italian Biſhops*, their oppoſing the *Papalins*. (See *Soave*, *p.* 166, 172, 223, 259, 267, 375.) And, what Motive theſe *Prelates* had in the former time of the *Council*, to follow the *Emperor*'s Intereſts, the ſame had they, in the latter end thereof, to follow the King of *Spain*'s; to whom, and not the *Emperor*, (after the Kingdom of *Spain*, and the *Emperor* diſ-
‖ See *Soave*, *p.* 694. united) belonged theſe Dominions in *Italy*; ‖ and therefore, in this time, we find many of them ſiding with the *Spaniſh Prelates*: See *Soave*, *p.* 558, 609. *He mentions alſo (*p.* 558.) *an Averſion, and Envy, which the other* Italian Biſhops *had againſt thoſe, favoured, and preferred by the Court of* Rome. Beſides this, *He repreſents elſewhere the *Venetian*, and *Florentine Prelates*, alſo to comply with the Intereſts of thoſe States, importuned hereunto by
‖ See *p.* 559. the Ambaſſadors: ‖ And therefore, (*p.* 504.) brings in the *Pope* applying
† See *Soave*, *p.* 231, 468, 496, 551, 559, 609, 711. himſelf to theſe Ambaſſadors.—— *That their Princes would recommend the Cauſe of the Papacy to their Ambaſſadors in* Trent, *and command them to cauſe the* Prelates *of their States not to be preſent in the Parlies againſt the* Apoſtolick See. Again: * He relates their joining (all, or a great part of them) with the other *Biſhops*, againſt the Endeavours of the *Pope*, and his *Legates*, in all
‖ *p.* 254, 144, 145. thoſe Controverſies moved concerning the *Epiſcopal Duties, and Rights, Inſtitution, Reſidence, Exemption of Regulars*, &c. named formerly; † as likewiſe,
† *p.* 559, 567. concerning the *non-remitting of Reformations to his Holineſs*: ‖ *The Permiſſion of the Cup*, carried negatively againſt the *Legates*, † and ſeveral other Mat-
‖ *p.* 699, 769. ters: ‖ All which things the *Council* could not have done, contrary to the

Pope's

Pope's Mind (as *Soave* would have it) without a conſiderable number of *Italian Prelates* oppoſing him, ſince theſe were the *Major* Part of the *Council*. So (*p.* 660.) He brings in the *French Ambaſſadors* complaining of the *Secretary* of the *Council*, as not faithfully ſetting down the *Votes*; which ſhews, that they apprehended a *Major* Part, oppoſite to that which prevail'd. Laſtly, (which may confirm all this) * He is every where diſcovering the *Legates*, and the *Pope*'s Fears and Jealouſies, and various Cunnnings, and Diverſions, to compaſs their Ends; often brings in his *Holineſs*, making grievous Complaints againſt the *Council*'s Proceedings, and againſt his own *Legates* too; ſeveral times, thinking to *diſſolve* the *Council*; ſometimes, to ſecure himſelf by *Arms*; † often ſolliciting the ſecular *Princes* to move their *Biſhops* in his behalf; || ſometimes relying on the Help of ſome eminent Perſons in the *Council*; as on the Cardinal of *Lorraine*, † and others. * So (*p.* 258.) He brings in Pope *Paul* the Third, reſenting,——*How little he was eſteemed of the Council; in that It, having given hope to refer the Reformation to him, whereof he had framed a Bull, and recalled the whole Matter to* Rome, *they had after treated thereof more ſharply, without any reſpect to his Authority: That he ſaw, that all was in the* Emperor*'s power,—— and was aſſured, that the Prelates, who did alſo then adhere to the* Court *of* Rome, *when ever the* Emperor *ſhould unmask himſelf, would profeſs to be on his ſide, either for fear of greater Power, or for emulation at the* Pope*'s Greatneſs; which they would diſcover, when they ſhould ſee a ſecure way laid open to moderate it.* * And (*p.* 515, and 516.) upon occaſion of *Reſidency*, he repreſents,—— *The* Court *of* Rome *exclaiming, That a Schiſm was plotted in the Council, and an Apoſtacy from the* Apoſtolick See; *and* Pius IV. *complaining both of the Prelates, and of his own Legates; that all were united againſt him*, &c. Yet, this, after that the ſame *Soave* had related † the *Pope*'s ſending ſo many *Penſioners* of his to carry all things by a major number of Votes on his ſide. And *p.* 628. again, he makes the ſame *Pope* to break out into this Exclamation, occaſioned by the points of *Inſtitution*, and *Reſidency* of *Biſhops*:——*That all the Biſhops, Beneficed by him, were his oppoſites; and that he maintained an Army of Enemies in* Trent; *wiſhing that by any means the* Council *were Diſſolved.* * (*Pag.* 260.) He makes one Legate, conſulting, how to mollifie the combin'd Prelates, by his granting ſome of their Petitions: Another ſaying;——*That, to condeſcend to an Inferior (eſpecially to a multitude) was to make them to demand a greater ſatisfaction; that, firſt, he would try his Friends, and, when he found himſelf fortified with the greater number, would not retire an inch: but, if he found it otherwiſe, he would uſe Art.* *Pag.* 171. He makes, * the ſame Legates negotiating with the *Italian* Biſhops by thoſe Prelates, who were their aſſured Friends, to wiſh them to conſider, how much they were bound, for the Honor of their *Nation*, to uphold the Dignity of the *Papacy*: And, *p.* 754. * The Legates to be accuſed by the *Spaniſh* Ambaſſador, for ſoliciting the *Italians* for their Suffrages. What means this great Politician thus, amongſt their impregnable *Italian* Guards, and Votaries, in the Council, to torture the *Pope*, and his *Legates* on this manner, about procuring their aid; and to put them into ſo many ſuddain frights; and, ſo oft as he pleaſeth, entring

† *Pag.* 552.
|| *Pag.* 504.
† *Soave, p.* 766.
† *Pag.* 504.

entring into their Cabinet-Councils, to bring them upon his Stage, full of new *Projects?* And yet, no ſooner are their backs turn'd; and the *Prince*'s *Orators*, or the *Spaniſh Prelates*, entred upon it, and it come to their turn to ſpeak, but the Scene is quite changed; and we find theſe on the ſame rack: Now, the Council is kept in ſervitude by the *Italians* their *plurality* of Voices, all of them ſure to the *Pope*, for *Country*, or *Penſion*, or *Promiſes*, or *Fears*. Now, the *proponentibus Legatis* ſtrikes all the Council ſpeechleſs, as to the matters *Fundamental*, and of greateſt concernment: And ſometimes the Prelates of one Nation, ſometimes of another, are ready to *proteſt*. Writing contrary things, as they ſeem beſt to humor and adorn his preſent ſubject; and, as they do, alſo, ſome way or other, ſerve his ſiniſter *ends*, many times contrary one to another. For, the more of the Council he can make, in one place, to oppoſe the *Pope*, and his Miniſters in ſome point, the more here, he makes to appear the *Pope's Tyranny* in hindering, with divers arts, ſuch things to be defin'd. And, in another place, the more powerful and numerous he can ſhew the *Pope*'s Dependents in the Council to be, the more he repreſents the *Council enſlav'd*, and the *Pope* carrying all things therein, as he pleaſeth. This is replied to the *number* of *Italian* Biſhops.

§. 169. As for the other thing, the voting by *Nations* (and not by the number of perſons preſent) a way propoſed to remedy the predominancy in the Council of ſome *one Nation*, the inconvenience but now complained of, 1. It is a *new* way, never uſed in any Council, ſave two late ones, *Conſtance*, and *Baſil:* and in *Conſtance* upon an extraordinary occaſion, the *Election* of a *lawful Pope*, *when they were afraid, this Election would receive ſome diſturbance from the multitude of *Italians*, brought to the Council by Pope *John* the XXIII. and, *when ſeveral Nations alſo, adhering to ſeveral perſons (for there were then no fewer than three *Anti-Popes* reſiding in ſeveral places) probably would not have united in any new choice, that would be made without their particular conſent. Therefore alſo, in the Council of *Conſtance*, for the *Election* of a new *Pope*, *Martin* V. there were joined with the *Cardinals*, ſome other choſen *Prelates* out of each *Nation*. (See *Seſſ.* 41.) And this extraordinary way was then uſed, not as the beſt for condemning of *Hereſies*, but as, *pro tempore*, the moſt expedient, for curing a *Schiſm.*

‖ *A.D.* 1415 *n.* 14. & 16. Mean while, ſee in *Spondanus*, ‖ taken out of the *Acts* of this *Council* conſerv'd in the Library of St. *Victor*'s at *Paris*, the complaint and exceptions made by Pope *John* againſt this new courſe,—— *Unâ natione* (ſaith he) *alteri æquiparatâ, abſq; ullâ meriti, vel numeri, ratione,--- cum de Anglicanâ eſſent tres tantùm Prælati, & cæteri Clerici novem numero.* And then, ſee the Council thus clearing it ſelf. —— *Formam, à Synodo, majoris causâ ordinis, & compendii, ſtatutam, comprehendere utrumq; modum deliberandi; per Nationes, & per ſingula Suffragia: Cùm Viz. per Deputatos, ſive Delectos Nationum, primò, ſeparatim, poſt ad invicem, communicato Conſilio; Dehinc, per ipſas Nationes, ubi ſinguli liberi erant: tandem, collectis omnibus in unum Nationibus, ac Cardinalibus, in Seſſione publicâ quærebatur palam de ſingulis præmediatis, & examinatis, Articulis, utrum placerent; permiſſa cuilibet, ex priſcâ Conciliorum formâ, facultate*

tate dicendi, quæ vellet. We have the manner of it more clearly described in *Spondanus*, out of *Patricius*, in the beginning of the Council of *Basil* † thus. Out of the four *Nations* was a certain number chosen, to sit by themselves, and prepare matters, the four *Nations* having four *Convents* or Meetings: Again, out of every one of these Convents were chosen three; twelve in all, called *Deputati*, who sate together, and better digested, what any of the other four meetings represented to them: afterward their Judgment was return'd to the several Convents; and then, when all, or any three of these Convents consented in any thing, it was sent to the *President* of the *Council*, and by him proposed to all the members of it in a *General Congregation*; where all had their *free*, and *personal* Vote; and what was in this Congregation generally agreed on, was at last reduced into the Form of a *Decree*, and afterward recited, and confirmed in a *Publick Session*. Where, we see in the *General Congregation* all things are passed by personal Votes: (which proceeding also, the former words of the *Council* intimate, and justifie): Only the other *National* Consultations are premised for the more expedition, and better examination of things: and nothing could be proposed to the *General Congregation*, but which the Deputies of three of the four *Nations* had first stated, and agreed to. Now, setting aside such a distinction of, and prevoting by *Nations*, the preparation and examination of matters before every publick *Session* by certain select *Congregations*, or Meetings, seems not much different from that afterward used in this Council of *Trent*. 2. But this, whether *previous*, or *final*, Decision by the number of *Nations*, how few soever the *Representatives* of some of them be, as it is *now*; so, 2*ly*. seems very dangerous for raising Emulations, and Factions between Nations (to the rending of the Church's peace) and leaveth not the *Prelates* of every *Nation* so much at their own liberty to join their Vote with Aliens; nor permits the same scope for men of more *spirit*, *learning*, or *judgment*, of whatsoever Nation to guide the rest. 3*ly*, It would render the Councils deserted, and unfrequented, and consequently the affairs thereof not so well discussed: whilst *one Representative*, sent from one *Nation* will suffice; and equal in vote, and authority, an hundred sent from another; as here, only three Prelates sent from *England* did. 4*ly*, Again, either *all Nations* shall be allowed to have an *equal* Vote in the Council, or *unequal*; *if equal*; then, since the Bishops of three or four lesser Kingdoms, or States, do not equal the Bishops of one greater, thus a much smaller part of the Church may over-vote, and conclude the greater; *if unequal*; how shall a just proportion be prescribed? 5*ly*, Add to this, that the *multitude* in Council of the *Prelates* of some Nation more than of another, is, without this new device, already remedied; for this being once agreed on, that the Decrees of the Prelates present in a Council oblige not, unless accepted by the *major* part of *Nations*, and by their *Prelates*, that are absent, the greater number of one *Nation* in the Council than of another, cannot oblige the Absents, if more, to the observance of their Decrees. 6*ly*. Such an Innovation could not be made in *Trent* without the consent of the *Council*; and those *Nations*, of which the Council mostly consisted, would never

† *A. D.* 1431. 11.

have conſented to have the Vote of *one*, or *two* Biſhops from ſome other Countries, perhaps much inferior in their natural, or ſpiritual parts, and their Co-Patriots unconſulted, to counterpoſe all their's. 7. Laſtly, As to the points of *Doctrine*; the ſame thing in effect was obſerved in the *Council*, or ſomthing more; For, nothing can be ſhewed to have been paſſed in the Council, as to matter of Doctrine, from which the Biſhops, how few ſoever they were, of any one Nation, eſteemed *Catholick*, and ſo rightly challenging a Vote, declared their *diſſent*; and, though perhaps few, yet they were looked upon, as the repreſentative of a Body conſiderable, againſt which (as hath been ſaid) the Council concluded no *Article of Faith*; as in ſtating which Articles they guided themſelves by former evident *Tradition*, or moſt clear *Conſequences* thereof.

§. 170. To 4. To the *Fourth*. The *Pope*'s giving *Penſions*. The thing is confeſſed, but hath two handles, by which, as it is taken, it is rendred commendable, or culpable. On the one ſide, it might be a great *charity*, and argue a deſire only, that the Council might be *numerous*, and *full*, and aſſiſted with many able perſons, ſome of which (not minding wealth ſo much) are not unoften *low* in their *Eſtates*. On the other ſide, it might be a great *policy*, and argue a deſire to have many in the Council his *Dependants*. Whether out of one, or both of theſe reſpects, ſuch *penſions* were allowed, I cannot ſay: but by an act that may be lawfully done, and juſtified, none can prove the Council illegal: And alſo, in favor of the former pretence, we may conſider: * That *poorer* Biſhops in former Councils have had their charges born, at leaſt, by the *Emperor*, one not without *Deſigns*: * That the *Council* of *Trent* ſate extraordinary long in compariſon of other Synods; the charges of continuing there great; not a few Biſhops, and other Divines, poor: great ſcarcity of Biſhops attending the Council, eſpecially in its firſt beginning; the more neceſſitous, without ſome maintenance of their charges, threatning to depart: as *Soave* himſelf acknowledgeth, *p.* 124: and therefore the Legates themſelves were forced to open the *Pope*'s Purſe for the ſupport of ſome of them, before they had his leave; and (ſaith *Pallav. l.* 24. *c.* 14. *n.* 7.) theſe *penſions* were ſo ſmall, being but five and twenty Crowns a month, that the Biſhops ſo reliev'd, ſtaid not without murmuring, that, thus, they were deprived of a juſt pretence to go away; and the *Pope* had more ill will from them for their ſo long neceſſitated attendance, than thanks for his allowance; and, often complaining of their want, ſome of them (ſath he) in the conſultations, gave more *moleſtation*, than ſome *others*, both to the Legates, and to the *Pope*. But, if theſe *penſions* were ſo advantageous to the *Pope*'s ſervice, it had been eaſie for *Chriſtian Princes*, by the like allowances to ſo many *poor* Biſhops of their own Dominions, to have countermined ſuch Policies.

§. 171. To 5. To the *Fifth*. The *admitting Titular Biſhops*. 'Tis true, that ſome *Titular Biſhops* were in the Council, but they are juſtified, by their, allowed, *Ordination* of *Prieſts*, to be *true* Biſhops; and therefore might lawfully repair

pair to the Council, and Vote therein without asking any one's leave. I find not any ſaid to be in the Council, who were not made Biſhops before it. Neither do I find *Soave* charging the *Pope*, as ſome others do, either of erecting any *new Biſhopricks*, or creating *Titular Biſhops*, during the ſitting of the *Council*; nor yet any mentioned to be ſent thither by the *Pope*, ſave two, and thoſe at the firſt beginning of the Council, nor theſe meerly Titular, *Olaus Magnus*, and *Robert Venantius Waucap*; One Archbiſhop of *Upſalie* in *Sweden*, the other of *Armagh* in *Ireland*, both excluded from their Sees by *Princes*, *enemies* to the *Catholick Faith*. Of whom, as you may read what is ſaid in *Soave*, *p.* 140. to their diſparagement; ſo you may ſee what is ſaid in *Pallavicino*, *l.* 6. *c.* 5. and in *Spondanus* †† to their commendation: The *Pope* ſending them thither as for their great parts, ſo chiefly for their Country, one being a *Sweed*, the other a *Scot*, that *moſt Nations* might have ſome perſons in the Council *relating* to them. Laſtly, If there were any ſuch Titulars ſent by the *Pope*, the ſame may be ſaid of them, as hath been of ‖ the *Italians* in general: * That the *Pope* found but little aſſiſtance from them, where he moſt needed them; nor was any advantageous thing done for *Him* in the Council by their help: * That the *Council* was a great enemy to ſeveral practices of theirs, and paſſed ſeveral Acts † againſt them; eſpecially, that they ſhould Exerciſe no *Pontifical* Act on the Subjects of another *Biſhop* without his licence: (when, probably, had there been any conſiderable number of them in the *Council*, ſome of them would have ſpoken, there, in their own defence.) But yet the Council thought not fit to ſuppreſs, for the future, the creating any ſuch Biſhops, for the reaſons given in *Soave*, *p.* 717. *Becauſe theſe neceſſary to ſupply the places of unable Biſhops; or, of thoſe who have a lawful cauſe to be abſent from their Churches; or of Prelates, employed in greater affairs.*

†† *A. D.* 1546. *n.* 3.

‖ §. 167.

† *Conc. Trid. Seſſ.* 6. *c.* 4. *de Reform.* — *Seſſ.* 14. *c.* 2

To the *Laſt*; The Prohibition of Biſhop's *Proxies* to give *definitive Votes*: *Proxies* were admitted in all *Conſultations*, and had, in them, a Vote with the reſt, but were not admitted to have a Definitive Vote in the *Council* for this reaſon: Leſt ſo, whilſt many Biſhops pretended neceſſary cauſe of abſence, theſe their *Subſtitutes*, coming abundantly from all parts, might *over-bear* the *Biſhops* in the *Council*; theſe being Men, of whoſe Abilities the Council could not have the ſame preſumption, as they might of the Biſhops themſelves: and this being a thing, which thoſe *Prelates*, who afforded their own *perſonal* attendance, would be much offended with. Yet was it attempted, to have allowed a Definitive Vote to the *Proxies* of ſome Biſhops *neceſſarily* abſent, as to ſome of the *German Biſhops*; but that this could not be eaſily done, excluſively to others †. Whether their Definitive Vote alſo was oppoſed for another reaſon (alledged by *Proteſtants*) *viz.* leſt the *Italian* Biſhops ſhould ſo be *over-voted*, I cannot judge: But thoſe Biſhops, who ſent Proxies, themſelves afterward, *accepting* the Council, did what was equivalent to their own, or their Proxie's, *definitive* Voting in it. But, to conclude this matter, ſuppoſe, That theſe Six things objected were confeſſed to have been uſed unjuſtly, and to the prejudice of the Council, in

§. 172. To 6.

† See *Pall. l.* 20. *c.* 17. *n.* 8. — *l.* 21. *c.* 1. *n.* 11.

ſome things; yet it appears from the ſecond and third Conſideration above, §. 148, 150. that they could caſt no blemiſh upon its authority in thoſe things, which were therein, *actually*, and *unanimouſly*, eſtabliſhed; which is enough to overthrow the *Reformation*.

CHAP. XI.

IV. Head. *Of the Council's many Definitions, and Anathemas.*

1. *That all Anathemas are not inflicted, for holding ſomthing againſt Faith,* §. 173.
2. *That matters of Faith have a great latitude: and ſo conſequently, the errors, that oppoſe Faith, and are liable to be Anathematized,* §. 175. Where;
   Of the ſeveral ways, wherein things are ſaid to be of Faith, §. 176.
3. *That all* General *Councils to the world's end have equal Authority in defining matters of Faith: And, by the more Definitions, the Chriſtian Faith ſtill more perfected,* §. 177. Where;
   Of the true meaning of the Epheſine *Canon, reſtraining Additions to the Faith,* §. 178.
4. *That the Council of* Trent *prudently abſtained from the determining of many Controverſies, moved there,* §. 184.
5. *That the* Lutheran's *many erroneous Opinions in matters of Faith engaged the* Council *to ſo many contrary Definitions,* §. 185.
6. *That all the Anathemas of this Council extend not to meer Diſſenters,* §. 186.
7. *That this Council, in her Definitions, decreed no* new *Divine Truth, or* new *matter of Faith, which was not formerly ſuch, at leaſt in its neceſſary Principles.* Where;
   In what ſence Councils may be ſaid to make new Articles of Faith, and in what not, §. 192.
8. *That the chief* Proteſtant *Controverſies, defined in this Council of* Trent, *were ſo in ſome former Councils,* §. 198.
9. *That the* Proteſtant *Churches have made new Counter-Definitions, as particular as the* Roman; *and obliged their Subjects to believe, and ſubſcribe them,* §. 199.
10. *That a Diſceſſion from the Church, and Declaration againſt its Doctrines, was made by* Proteſtants *before they were any way ſtraitned, or provoked, by the* Trent-*Decrees, or* Pius *his* Creed, §. 202.

§. 173. THUS much (from §. 147,) touching the *third* Head; the *legal* Proceedings of this *Council*. Now we come to the Fourth; Touching the many *Decrees* and *Canons*, *Definitions* and *Anathemas*, of this *Council*, much exceeding thoſe of any former; and ſome of them ſaid to be in very ſlight matters; by which this Council is charged to have multiplied, and impoſed on

on *all* Christians, so many *new Articles* of *Faith*; and *Pius* his *Bull*, that followed it, to have added *twelve new ones*, to the *Creed*. *Thus, when as the Reformation* [as Mr. *Thorndike* complains, in Conclusion to his *Epilogue*] *might have been only Provisional, till a better understanding between the parties might have produced a tolerable agreement, this Council cut off all hopes of Peace, except by yielding to all their Decrees.* In this matter therefore, for the *Council's Defence*, I shall propose to you these Ten *Considerations* following.

The *First*. That all *Anathemas* in Councils are not passed, for holding 1.
somthing against *matter* of *Faith*, but for other Misdemeanors, and Trespasses against *Obedience*, and good manners; Amongst which this may be reckoned one; If any one raiseth Factions, and Sects, and disturbeth the Church's Peace, in *contradicting* her common Doctrines, of how *small* consequence soever these Doctrines be; or spreadeth abroad Propositions *Schismatical*, and Scandalous, and apt to corrupt good manners, or, be made ill use of by the simple, though the matter of them be not properly *Heretical*, or opposing an *Article*, that is *de fide*.

Again, *Anathemas*, that are inflicted by the Church for holding somthing *contrary* to the *Faith*, are not always, or most usually denounced, for those more *fundamental* and *necessary* points of Faith, an error in which ruines *Salvation*; but also, and more commonly (because these are more) for some *lesser* matters of Faith; *viz.* any, whereby some dammage, smaller or greater, comes, as to the Author from holding them, so to others, from his maintaining, and divulging them abroad: The *Church* being very vigilant (contrary to Sects) to eradicate the least deviations from the Faith; which are observed by the *Apostle* to be of the nature of a *Cancer*, still eating further into the bowels of Truth; she not knowing, how far they may enlarge themselves, and by litle and litle invade higher Points, and lay the Foundation for more pernicious errors. Nor doth the punishment of *Anathema*, in these, eye so much the *greatness*, and malignity of the error, as the *pertinacy*, and obstinacy of its Abettor, refusing submittance to the Church's Authority; the violating of which *Authority* may be a great fault, and of very ill consequence, though in a small matter. *If he will not hear the Church* (saith our Lord) *let him be to thee, as an Heathen* * [an Excommunicated, or Anathematized, person]. Where the censure lies upon his *not hearing* the Church; be the matter, in which, small or great. 1 *Tim.* 2. 17. *Matth.* 18. 17.

And the great guilt of the *obstinancy* against the Definitions of *Superiors*, §. 174.
though in the maintaining only of some *small* errors in the Faith, some *Protestants* seem to acknowledge: and confess it well to merit so high a Censure. Of which thus Dr. *Ferne*; † *---We acknowledge, that he who shall pertinaciously, and turbulently speak, and teach, against the Doctrines of the Church in points of less moment, may deserve to be Anathematized, or put out of the Church; for, such an one, though he deny not the Faith, yet makes a breach of Charity: whereby he goes out of the Church, against which he so sets himself.* Thus this Doctor. [Only he would have the *Church* to distinguish between *pertinacious*, and *modest*, gain-saying, (which is to know Hearts): and this *latter* he would have to pass free from this *censure*; and such he would

† *Considerations on the Church of Engl. Pre-face.*

would have that of the *Reformers* to be. Was that of *Luther*, then, ſo modeſt? Or doth not the weight and venerableneſs of the *Church's Authority* render all known contradiction whatever truly guilty of *Pertinacy*, and *Pride?*]

† *Vindic. of Church of Eng. p. 27.* Again: Thus Biſhop *Bramhal*, † —— *When inferior Queſtions, not Fundamental, are once defined by a lawful General Council, all Chriſtians, though they cannot aſſent in their judgments, are obliged to Paſſive Obedience, to poſſeſs their Souls in patience. And they who ſhall oppoſe the Authority, and diſturb the Peace of the Church* [for ſuch a point non-fundamental] *deſerve to be puniſht as Hereticks* [*i. e.* Anathematized]. And Cardinal *Bellarmin* ſaith ‖ of *Provincial* Councils: That —— *Judicium non-infallibile tamen ſufficit ad Excommunicandum.* And —— *Debent privati homines acquieſcere ejuſmodi judicio, donec non judicaverit aliter* Apoſtolica Sedes, *vel* Concilium Univerſale, [theſe two, it ſeems, only do ſet at liberty our Tongues from the Obligations of *Inferior* Councils] *ſi ſecùs egerint, meritò Excommunicantur.* Notwithſtanding, though an *Anathema*, in ſuch caſes is well deſerved from the wilful adherence of ſuch perſons to their own fancies, againſt their Superiors; yet it is never inflicted meerly for this; but always for ſome danger alſo in ſuch a Tenent, if ſpread abroad to others; the remedy of which danger of infecting others, ſeems chiefly to be intended in the Church's uſing ordinarily in ſuch *Canons: Si quis dixerit*, rather than *ſenſerit.*

‖ *De Concil. l. 2. c. 10.*

§. 175. 2. *Secondly*, Concerning the *Extent* of matter of Faith, You muſt know: That all *Divine Revelations* whatever, and all neceſſary *Deductions* from any *Article* of *Faith*, could they proceed *in infinitum*, are alſo, when known, the matter or Objects, or Articles, of our Faith, as well as the more chief, neceſſary, points thereof; (unleſs we may diſ-believe ſomthing, that we grant to be *God's Word*). And are all *Traditional* from the Apoſtles times, either in their own expreſs terms, or in their neceſſary *Principles*; ſince new Divine Revelations none pretend: And, conſequently, the contrary *error* to any of theſe *Deductions*, when ever it ſeems very hurtful, may be *Anathematized.*

§. 176. And, amongſt theſe *Divine Revelations*, and matter of our Faith, are to be reckoned theſe two Propoſitions of no litle conſequence; *viz. The Doctrine of Chriſtian Liberty*; namely, That all things are *lawful* unto us, which *God's Word* hath not prohibited. And, again, this; That the *Church* hath Authority committed to Her by our Lord, in ſuch *lawful* things, to make *Conſtitutions*, and *Decrees* obliging all her Subjects to Obedience. So that one that affirms ſomthing to be prohibited in God's Word, or unlawful, that is not ſo prohibited; or one that denies Obedience to the *Precepts* of the *Church*, made in things not contrary to *God's* Word, offends againſt the *Faith*; and, on this account, is liable to an *Anathama*. And, in theſe things, our *Belief*, according to the ſeveral objects thereof, is required of us in a ſeveral manner.

1. In pure *ſpeculatives*; If it be a thing made known to us to be revealed *by God*, the *Faith*, that is required of us upon ſuch *Revelation*, is to believe

lieve it a certain *Truth*. 2. In *Practicals*, if it be a thing by *God* commanded, or prohibited, the *Faith* required of us, upon such Divine *Revelation*, is to believe, that it is our necessary *Duty* to do, or to abstain from it. 3. But, if it be a thing of which we have no Divine Precept; a thing neither enjoyned, nor prohibited by *God*; in all which sort of things, *Divine Revelation* hath declared our *Liberty*, the *Faith* required of us, according to such Revelation, is to believe it *lawful* (I mean, as to *God*'s Law) to be done, or to be omitted, as we please. 4. Lastly, Among these *lawful* things also; if it be a thing concerning which we have a Precept of the *Church* to do it; or, where the Lawfulness is doubted of, a Declaration of the *Church*, that it is lawful to be done; (which *Church*, *God* in his Word hath commanded, in such her Judgment, to be submitted to; and, in such her Precepts, to be obeyed) the *Faith* required of us from such *Divine Revelation*, is; That it is both *lawful* to be observed; and, the Observation thereof our *Duty*. And consequently, he who denies the Lawfulness thereof, or Obedience thereto, opposeth a *Divine Revelation*: Though the thing we do, is not commanded by any *Divine Revelation*; nor the particular Lawfulness of it declared in *God*'s Word. Such a Point of Faith is the Lawfulness of *Communicating* only in *one* kind: Of which thus the *Council* of *Trent*, Sess. 21. c. 1. ——*Si quis dixerit, ex Dei præcepto, vel necessitate salutis, omnes, & singulos* Christi *Fideles utramq; speciem sanctissimi Eucharistiæ Sacramenti summere debere, Anathema sit.* Such the Duty of *Communicating once a Year*: Sess. 13. c. 19.——*Si quis negaverit, omnes, & singulos* Christi *Fideles utriusque sexus, cùm ad annos discretionis pervenerint, teneri, singulis annis, saltem Paschate, ad communicandum, juxta præceptum Sanctæ matris Ecclesiæ; Anathema sit.* And so the Seventh and Tenth Canon. ——*Si quis dixerit, non licere*, &c. And such that, *Sess.* 24. c. 4. *De Matrimon.* ——*Si quis dixerit, Ecclesiam non posse constituere*, &c. *Anathema sit:* And so, *Can.* 9. And such is the *Duty* in general, of observing the *Church*'s *Traditions*. Of which, thus, the Seventh *General* Council, (Act. 7.) *Si quis Traditiones Ecclesiæ, sive scriptas, sive consuetudine valentes, non curaverit; Anathema sit.*

Thirdly, That all *Councils* to the World's end, and not only the *Four* or *Three* first, before the passing of the *Ephesine Canon*, † (which *Canon* is said to restrain it) may *define* and *determine* not only the *greater*, but these *smaller* Matters of *Faith*; and may make new Points to be *de fide*, or *creditu necessaria*, (in such a Sense as is explained below, §. 192.) which were not formerly, when they see occasion thereof; and, when contrary Errors do arise, which they apprehend dangerous to Divine *Truth*; or to *good Life*; or to the Church's *Peace*. And there seems no Reason against it, but that a *Council* may be as ample in the *Protection*, and asserting of *Truth*, not only in gross, and in some general, and principal Matters; but by Retail, as it were, in every part, and parcel thereof; as *Innovations* are, in *invading* it, that every Poison may have its Antidote; especially, when little-seeming Errors, not crushed at their first Appearance, do insensibly ascend, from the overthrow of some Conclusion, to that of the Premises; till they undermine, at last, some Truths more principal. Who blames a Parent for binding his Children

§. 177. 3.

† *Conc. Ephes.* c. 7.

dren to abſtain from things hurtful, becauſe ſuch things are, in a *leſs* degree, and not *exceedingly*, hurtful; or, for prohibiting them ſomthing, which is not down-right Poiſon, and immediatly mortal; but yet, which by litle and litle, may alter, and corrupt the Healthful Conſtitution of their Body: Of which noxious things the *Parents*, not the *Children*, are fitteſt *Judges?*

Neither are the *Church*'s *Subjects* any way diſobliged in her thus, from Age to Age, multiplying their Credends; but much indebted, for this her Motherly Care of them: who before, whil'ſt they had more Liberty of Opinion, ſo alſo had leſs Light, in their Progreſs toward Heaven; and more By-paths open to ſtray in, and more Liableneſs to err; or, by the Heretical, to be ſeduced in thoſe things, in the truth of which they are now, by that Judgment, which *God*'s Wiſdom hath deputed to direct them, and by the beſt which the World can afford, eſtabliſhed. Unleſs here, with the *Hereticks*, we will blame, after the Foundation laid of the *Apoſtle*'s *Creed*, the *Explications* of the *Nicene*, or *Athanaſian:* Or, after this, the many Articles paſſed in latter *Synods*, concerning *Grace*, and *Freewill*; and the *Anathemas* annexed againſt the *Pelagian* Errors herein: Or alſo, complain of the Obligation we now have to a great Roll of *Credends* under the *Goſpel*; from which thoſe, in the darker times of the *Law*, ſtood free. Add to this, that the Suppreſſion of any new *Error*, muſt *neceſſarily* increaſe the *Faith:* And, in immediate Contraries, who is to renounce the *Negative*, muſt believe and hold the *Affirmative:* Neither is it poſſible, that the *Church*, in ſuch Points, can make any Fence to keep out her Enemies, but ſhe muſt alſo, at the ſame time, within it, incloſe her Friends.

§. 178. It is much urged, indeed, by Dr. *Hammond*, in Anſwer to the *Catholick Gentleman*, (8. *Chap.* §. 2. and repeated in *Hereſ.* §. 7. *p.* 100.) and by Biſhop *Bramhal*, and others, ſee before, §. 6. (α) ——*That* the *Epheſine*, the Third *General Council*, made a *Decree: That it ſhould not be lawful, for any Man to produce, write, or compoſe any Belief, beſides that which was Eſtabliſhed by the Fathers at* Nice, *&c.* (β) *That the* Greeks, *in the Council of* Florence, *preſſed this Authority to the* Latines; *and ſaid, That no Man would accuſe that* Faith [or Creed] *of Imperfection, unleſs he were mad.* (γ) *That the* Latines, *in their Reply, acknowledged, that this Decree did forbid all* Difference *of* Faith *from this* Creed, *as well as* Contrariety: And, (δ) *That* Celeſtine's *Epiſtle (quoted in that* Council) *affirmeth; That the Belief delivered by the* Apoſtles, [*i. e.* the *Apoſtle*'s Creed] *requires that there be neither Addition, nor Diminution.* Theſe things are urged, to ſhew; That the *Council* of *Trent* had no juſt Authority to make any *new Articles* of *Faith.* But I imagine; that, after you have but a litle with me conſidered this *Epheſine Canon*, with the due Circumſtances, you will diſcerne a ſtrange Miſ-application.

α

β

γ

δ

§. 179. *n.* 1. 1. It is meet, that I firſt ſet you down the Words thereof, with what immediatly precedes them.——*Sermocinatio ejuſdem Sancti Concilii, poſtquam, & Canones editi à.* 318. *Sanctis, beatiſq; Patribus, qui* Niceæ *convenerant, & impium Symbolum à* Theodoro Mopſueſtino *Epiſcopo,* [a Ring-leader of the *Neſtorian* Hereſie] *confictum, & eidem* Epheſino *Concilio traditum à* Clariſio *Presbytero* Philadelphienſi, *recitata fuiſſent.——His igitur recitatis conſtituit ſanctum*

ctum Concilium, ut nemini liceat aliam fidem vel proferre, vel conscribere, vel componere, quàm eam, quæ præstituta, ac præscripta est à Sanctis Patribus, qui in Nicenorum *urbe*, [in which *Creed* the Additions also of the *Constantinopolitan Council* are here supposed to be included] *cum auxilio Spiritus Sancti coacti fuerunt. Qui autem audeat aliam fidem vel compenore vel proferre, volentibus converti ad agnitionem veritatis sive ex Gentilitate, sive Judaismo*, &c. [to be professed by them at their Admission into the *Church*,] *ut hi, si quidem Episcopi sint, ab Episcopatu removeantur; sin autem Laici sint, ut extremâ detestatione, & execratione percellantur.* This being the Canon.

To (*a.*) I say: *First*, That, this *Canon* being pressed by the *Greeks* against the *Latines*, in the *Florentine Synod*, to prove the Unlawfulness of the *Latine's* Addition to the *Creed* of [*Filioq;*], either the *Reformed* must approve the Sense the *Latines* gave of that *Decree* [namely, that the *Ephesine Council* prohibited only, that none should compose any Model of Faith disagreeing, or *contrary* in any thing to the Doctrine of the *Nicene Creed* (as *Theodorus* his wicked Creed was, which occasioned this Decree)]; or must confess, that the *Latines* unjustly retain, and mention [*Filioq;*] in their *Creeds*; which was added to the *Creeds*, after the *Ephesine*, and the four first *Councils*; † being first mentioned, and found in the *Creed*, in the Fourth *Toletan Council*, about *A. D.* 680. as the *Roman* Writers themselves confess.

§. 179. n. 2.

R. To *a.*

† See *Conc. Florent.* 7. *Sess.*

Secondly, That, supposing the *Council* prohibits not only the Composing, or Addition of any thing *contrary* to the *Nicene Creed*, (as *Theodorus* his *Nestorian Creed*, the occasion thereof, may perswade, it did) but the *Addition* thereto, or Alteration in Expression, of any thing whatsoever, though never so conformable to the *Nicene Creed*; yet this Prohibition extends not to *Councils*, but only to *private* Persons, and *Church-Governors*; according to that, [*Hi, si quidem Episcopi sunt, ab Episcopatu removeantur*]: For who shall execute this Sentence upon a *General Council?* Or, how can one *General Council* justly limit, or prescribe to *another* of equal Authority?

Thirdly, Supposing, that they extend this Act to *Councils* also; either they prohibit to them not the making *new* Definitions in matters of Faith, but only the *adding* of such Definitions made to the *body* of the *Nicene Creed*; but then, this Act concerns none, who afterward make new Definitions, so they add them not to the *Creed*. Now, no Additions at all have been made to that *Creed*, since the Fourth *General Council*, save [*Filioq;*] which the *Protestants* also allow of, and use. Or,

Fourthly, If the *Ephesine Fathers* prohibit to the *Councils* any such *Definitions* also, as well as *Additions to the Creed* after *Nice*, they condemn themselves in the first Place; who, though they added not to the *Creed*, yet *defined* [*Maria, Θεοτόκος*]. And if the *Ephesine Canon* be taken in either of these Senses, thus it will be found not to be observed by the very *next General* Council, that of *Chalcedon*; who made another *new Definition*, or Creed against *Eutyches*; in which also they altered some Expressions of the *Nicene* Creed, (as is noted by the *Latines*, *Concil. Florent.* §. 6.) *altered* [*natum ex Patre* i. e. *ex Substantiâ Patris*] into [*Consubstantialem Patri secundùm Divinitatem, nobis autem secundùm humanitatem*]: And added many other things, as appears

pears in their Confeſſion of Faith, (*Seſſ.* 5.) which Confeſſion they conclude, and ſeal up, juſt after the ſame manner, as the *Epheſine Council* before them did: —— *Decrevit ſancta atq; univerſalis hæc Synodus aliam fidem nemini licere proferre, ſive conſcribere, aut exponere, vel ſentire. Sed eos, qui audent vel componere, vel tradere aliud Symbolum volentibus ſe convertere, &c. ſi Epiſcopi ſunt, alienes eſſe ab Epiſcopatu, &c. ſi Laici, Anathematizari.* †

† See *Conc. Florent. Seſſ.* 1.

Fifthly, That both *Leo* Biſhop of *Rome*, and *Flavianus*, and *Euſebius*, being charged by the *Eutychian* Faction, as offending againſt this *Decree* of *Epheſus*, in their aſſerting as a part of their *Faith*: *Chriſtum ex duabus, & in duabus ſimul naturis eſſe*, an Article not contained in the *Nicene Creed*, were cleared by the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, as not guilty thereof, who (ſome of them probably the ſame, who ſate in the *Epheſine Council*; that being only Twenty Years before this) underſtood it in the Senſe of the *Latines*, and urged the neceſſity of Additions; as appears in the Speech of that *Council* to *Flavianus* the *Emperor*. ||

|| See below §. 183. *n.* 1.

Sixthly, Taken in ſuch a Senſe, as to forbid to *Councils* not only the adding to the *Nicene Creed*, but alſo the defining any new thing in matter of Faith, it is (as was ſaid before) not only *null*, by an equal Authority reverſing it in this Senſe, but moſt *irrational*; ſince the like Occaſions of making ſuch new Definitions, may happen at any time after this *Epheſine Council*, as it did before, and alſo in, it.

§. 180. To β. To (β.) If the *Grecians* meant [*Imperfection*] in reſpect of the *expreſs Confutation* of any *Error* againſt *Faith*, then both the Authority of the *Latine Church*, and all the Reaſons given above, may be produced againſt them: But if they mean [*Imperfection*] in reſpect of containing all *Credends*, in reſpect of *Salvation* neceſſary to be *explcitly* known, its granted; that ſo is the *Apoſtle's Creed* not *imperfect*; yet were Additions to it lawfully made by *Nice*.

§. 181. To γ. To (γ.) The *Latines* joine [*contrary*] alſo to it, when they name [*different*,] and mean only ſuch Difference, as is alſo *contrary*: as is clear every where by their Words, in that *Synod*; *Seſſ.* 11. *Julianus Cardinalis* thus: —— *Quæ quidem verba* [(i. e.) *Concilii* Epheſini] *nos credimus hoc ſolùm ſignificare, ut fas ſit nulli*, Nicænorum *Patrum fidei contrarium proferre*. Is the Addition [*Filioq;*] which *Proteſtants* juſtifie, nothing *diverſe*? Then neither ſhall any other new Definitions of *Councils* be ſo.

§. 182. To δ. To (δ.) *Celeſtine's* Words, which are ſpoken of the *Apoſtle's Creed*, either do not prohibit other *Councils* making ſome ſort of Additions; or do condemn *Nice* for it. But ſee this Teſtimony explained by the *Latines*, (*Seſſ.* 10.) that he meant only, denying any thing, delivered in the *Apoſtle's Creed*, or aſſerting or adding any thing, contrary to it.

§. 183. *n.* 1. To conclude this matter: See the Defence, which the Fathers of the Fourth *General Council*, following the *Epheſine*, made to *Marcianus* the *Emperor*, in the Concluſion of that *Synod*, † concerning the *neceſſity* of making, from time to time, new *Definitions* and *Additions*, to explicate, and corroborate the former *Faith*, as new Errors ariſe to debilitate, or pervert it; returned in Anſwer to the *Eutychians*, and others, who, to obtain Liberty to their

† *Allocut. ad Marcianum.*

their own Opinions, accuſed *Leo*'s *Epiſtle*, and alſo the *Council*, of *Innovations* in matters of *Faith*, after the *Church*'s Doctrine, ſufficiently eſtabliſhed in the *Nicene Creed*. There——*Credentibus quidem* (ſaith the *Council*, Apologizing for it ſelf) *ſufficit, ad utilitatem, Fidei* [*i. e.* Nicenæ] *indiſcuſſa* [*i. e.* without further Conſequences multiplied from it] *proſpectio.*——*His autem, qui doctrinam rectam pervertere moliuntur, ad ſingula, quæ malè pariunt, oportet occurrere; & eorum objectis propria quæq; providere. Nam ſi omnes contenti, eſſent Fidei* [Nicenæ] *conſtituto* [which indeed, may alſo be ſaid of the *Apoſtle's Creed*] *& pietatis ſemitam nullâ innovatione turbarent, deceret Eccleſiæ Filios* [in Councils] *nihil ampliùs excogitare: Sed quia multi à rectâ lineâ per anfractus erroris exorbitant,——neceſſe nobis eſt, veritatis eos inventione convertere, commentaq; eorum devia ſalutaribus adjectionibus refutare; non, ut novum ad pietatem (quaſi Fides deſit) ſemper aliquid exquirentes: Sed ut, contrà ea, quæ ab illis innovata ſunt, excogitantes, quæ ſalubria judicantur.* Thus that *Council* Apologizeth for its new Definitions. Where *Excogitare*, and *veritatis inventione*, and the Adverſary's objecting to them *Innovation*, &c. ſhew, that *Councils* may define not only expreſs *Traditionals* in matters of Faith; but any *new Concluſions*, extracted from ſuch *Traditionals*.

Neither ſeems it to be much material. 1. Whether the *Definitions* of latter *Councils*, when inſerted into former *Creeds*, be called *Explanations* and *Declarations* of, or *Additions* to the former *Faith*, (which was a great Conteſt between the *Greek*, and the *Latine Church*, in the *Council* of *Florence*): provided, they be only ſuch things, as are granted to be *neceſſarily* educed out of former *Principles* of *Faith*. 2. Nor, 2*dly*, Much matters it, as to the *Aſſent*, that ought to be yielded to them, when known to be the *Church*'s Definitions; whether they be not inſerted into former *Creeds*; but delivered apart. For, an Obligation we have to the one ſort, as well as to the other. For example: There is no leſs an Obedience due to [*Maria* Θεοτόκος, or, *Dei Genitrix*: intimating the *Unity* of *Chriſt*'s *Perſon*, though compounded of two diſtinct *Natures*] defined by the Third *General Council*, though not interpoſed in the *Creed*; than to [*One Baptiſme*], or [*Filioq;*] which were, ſo, interpoſed. Only, it ſeems, that an *Inſertion* into the *Creed* is purpoſely made of thoſe *Points* of *Faith*, which, among the reſt, are conceived more neceſſary (not only to be *aſſented* to when known, but) to be explicitly *known*, by every *Chriſtian*; or, in infected times, fit to be diſtinctly confeſſed by every *Catholick*. Though yet ſo indifferent was this matter, as to principal Points; That *Maria* Θεοτόκος, which the *Greeks* urged in the *Council* of *Florence*, † that it was forborn to be added to the *Nicene Creed* by the *Epheſine* Fathers; yet is found, in terms equivalent, to be put in the *Athanaſian Creed* [*Not Two, but One* Chriſt *by Unity of Perſon*]: And this allowed of by the *Reformed*; and again, found, in expreſs terms, to be put, in the Definition of their Faith (according to ſome Copies) made ſhortly after, by the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, (ſee *Seſſ.* 5.) Where alſo, before the paſſing of this *Definition*, the Fathers cryed out, againſt the *Neſtorians*,---*Iſta Fides Orthodoxorum. Sancta Maria* Θεοτόκος, *ſcribatur*---*In Symbolo ſic addatur.* || As likewiſe afterward, found to be put, in expreſs terms, in the *Creed* of the Fourth *Toletan Council*. The

§. 183. *n.* 2.

† *Seſſ.* 5.

|| *Seſſ.* 5.

like may be ſaid of [*One Baptiſm for Remiſſion of Sins*] defined indeed againſt the *Novatians* by the *Nicene Council*; but by the Second *General Council* of *Conſtantinople*, firſt mentioned in the enlarged *Creed*. The like of that Clauſe, [*They that have done Evil into everlaſting Fire*] omitted in the *Conſtantinopolitan*; but put in the *Athanaſian Creed*, perhaps againſt the *Origeniſts*, who held the Fire temporary; and, *Malos, poſt purgationem malorum, regno Dei, luciq; reſtituendos* ‖. Nay; In the now-receiv'd *Apoſtle's Creed* it ſelf, there ſeems ſomthing to be additional, inſerted by latter Times, (*propter nonnullos Hæreticos*, ſaith *Ruffinus*, *in Expoſitione Symboli*) not found in the prime Copies thereof; at leaſt, not in thoſe antiently uſed in the *Roman Church*, as [*Deſcendit ad inferos*] and [*Vitam æternam*]. See the Authorities quoted by Archbiſhop *Uſher*, *De Symbolo Apoſtolico vetere Rom. Eccleſiæ.* This, in Explication of the much miſ-underſtood *Epheſine Canon*, urged as prohibiting any future *Additions* to the *Nicene Creed*; or, the following Ages *enlarging* the Articles of the former *Catholick Faith*. Now to proceed.

‖ *Auſtin de Hæreſ.*

§. 184. 4.

Fourthly, That many *Controverſies* and *Queſtions*, ſtarted in this *Council* of *Trent*; yet, becauſe they had not ſufficient *Evidence* in *Scripture* or *Tradition*, to decide them, were left unſtated by it. For which ſee what hath been ſaid formerly, §. 149. And great Prudence and Care was uſed, that nothing ſhould paſs there, from which any conſiderable number diſſented. And *Pallavicino* obſerves, ‖ out of ſeveral Regiſters of the *Council*'s Acts, whereof he had the peruſal, that *Soave*, perhaps the more to trouble, and muddy the Clearneſs of the *Catholick* Doctrine, as it oppoſed that of the Innovators; or to ſhew his own *Reading*, in Points, where there happens to be any *difference* among the *Schoolmen*, doth many times bring-in the Skirmiſhing of the *Theologues*, one with another, concerning them; when as, in Reality, there was no ſuch Conteſt amongſt them in the *Council*. Though, on the other ſide, this is not denied ſeveral times to have happened; and perhaps, ſome of the Diſputants deſirous, that their own Tenents might paſs for the common Doctrine of the *Church*: But, as I ſaid, the *Legates*, and others, not engaged in ſuch a Quarrel, by their great Judgment compoſed ſuch Strifes, without giving in the *Seſſion*, and the *Decree*, the Victory to either Side; a Moderation much complained of by the *Proteſtants*, the Spectators; who from thence might have hoped ſome *Schiſme*, and the Riſe of a *Civil War* in the *Catholick* Communion.

‖ *l.* 12. *c.* 1. *n.* 4.

§. 185. 5.

Fifthly, That the *Lutherans* broaching ſo many erroneous Poſitions, and joining together the Tenents of ſo many ſeveral Sects that had been before them, innovating ſomthing in every Part of Divinity, cauſed the *Council* of *Trent* to multiply ſo many *Anathemas* againſt them, and joine together alſo the Reſults of many former *Councils*: This being the Courſe obſerved in the *Council*; firſt, for ſome ſelected Perſons to read the *Lutheran* Writings on the Subject in hand; and to collect out of them the *erroneous* and *noxious* Propoſitions: And then, for the whole *Council*, when ſuch Propoſitions upon Examination, were unanimouſly diſallowed, to *Anathematize* (though ſome among theſe of much leſs Malignity than others) eſpecially, all thoſe *Errors*, which

which were deſtitute of the Patronage of ſome Reverend *Father*, or other Writer, of the *Church*; for where the *Council* found any ſuch Patronage, they uſed them more gently, and proſecuted them not with the like Vehemency. And, ſeeing that, in the Proceeding againſt *Sects*, ſome former *Councils* were wont only to condemn the *Sect* in general, and make mention only of the chief Heads of their Doctrine; other *Councils* again, more punctual, deſcended to the condemning of all the Particulars: This latter way was rather taken by the *Council* of *Trent*, not without mature Conſideration had in the beginning of the *Council*, concerning it; which is related by *Soave*, p. 192. where he ſaith: ——*That one Part deſired, that four or ſix Fundamental Articles of the new Doctrine, might be choſen and condemned,—— following the Example of the Antient Councils; which having declared the principal Article, condemned the Hereſie, never deſcending to particular Propoſitions, but condemning* [in general] *the Books of the Hereticks: That, in that univerſal, they comprehended all the pernicious Doctrine; and that the Honour of the Council ſo required. But the other Part* (ſaith he) *aimed to put under Cenſure all the Propoſitions, which might receive a bad Conſtruction, that thoſe* [amongſt them] *might be condemned, which in reaſon did deſerve it: Saying, That it was the Office of a Paſtor, to diſcern intirely the wholſom Graſs from the hurtful; and not to ſuffer the Flock to taſte of this. And if the Example of Antient Councils ought to be imitated, they ſhould imitate* * *that of* Epheſus, *which made ſo many, and ſo famous* Anathematiſms *againſt the Doctrine of* Neſtorius, *that theſe did contain whatſoever the Heretick had ſaid:* * *And the Councils of* Africa, *which deſcended to the Condemnation of all the Propoſitions of the Sects,* [See *Conc. Milevitan.* againſt the *Pelagian* Doctrines: *Conc. Gangrenſe: Syrmienſe: 2. Nican. Act.* 7. and laſtly, the *Council* of *Conſtance*, condemning Forty five Propoſitions of *Wicklief*, and Thirty of *John Huſs*] *the firſt Opinion did undoubtedly propoſe a more eaſie way, and would have left a Chink open for an Agreement, which future Times might produce: Yet the Second was embraced,* &c. Thus *Soave*. As for the former way, *leaving a Chink open for Agreement*, It may be more eaſily credited, when we ſhall ſee an Agreement advanced in thoſe Points, handled in the 25*th. Seſſion*; where the *Council*'s Determinations are ſo brief and general, as the *Council* eſcaped not, for this Generality alſo, the Cenſure of *Soave*'s Chorus: † As elſewhere it incurs their Diſpleaſure, for mincing Matters too much, and making every thing moved an Article of Faith. † *p.* 822.

Sixthly, That *all* the *Canons* in the Council of *Trent*, that have *Anathema* affixed (all which, except a very few, † run only in the form: *Si quis dixerit*) do not enjoin aſſent, under *Anathema*, to the contradictory propoſition, nor make it an Article of Faith neceſſary to be believed under the penalty of being reputed an Heretick, unleſs (ſaith *Canus* ‖) the Decree, to which ſuch Canon relates, bind to aſſent, with a——*Firmâ fide credendum*: & ——*Hoc eſt dogma Fidei Catholicæ.*——*Contrarium aſſerentes* [or *tenentes*] *judicentur pro Hæreticis:* Or ſome other equivalent expreſſion; or, unleſs the Canon run, *Si quis hoc ſenſerit*. And Cardinal *Bellarmin* ſaith much what the ſame †: ——*Quando autem Decretum proponatur tanquam de Fide, facile cognoſcitur* §. 186. 6. † See *Seſſ.* 4. *Seſſ.* 5. *c.* 1. ‖ *Com. loci.* *l.* 5. *c.* 5. † *De Concil. l.* 2. *c.* 12.

citur ex verbis Concilii. *Semper enim dicere ſolent,* 1 *ſe explicare fidem Catholicam:* —— 2 *vel, (quod eſt communiſſimum) dicunt Anathema, & ab Eccleſiâ excludunt eos, qui contrarium ſentiunt.* [But then, what, if it be only *Anathema iis qui contrarium dicunt,* or *docent?*] *Quando autem nihil horum dicunt, non eſt certum, rem eſſe de Fide.* Thus *Bellarmin.* For, this Council doth ſomtimes expreſly Anathematize, or Excommunicate, for *teaching,* or *publickly defending,* of ſome Error; or, for accuſing the *Church* of *error* in her teaching the contrary; when it doth not Anathematize the *holding* of ſuch an Error. An example of which * ſee, *Seſſ.* 24. *c.* 7. —— *Si quis dixerit Eccleſiam errare, cùm docuit, & docet, juxta Evangelicam, & Apoſtolicam doctrinam propter adulterium alterius conjugum Matrimonii vinculum non poſſe diſſolvi,* &c. *Anathema ſit.* Where the Council Anathematizeth thoſe, who *condemn* the *Church* of *erring* in teaching ſuch a Doctrine (as *Luther* did condemn the Church); but doth not Anathematize thoſe, who hold the contrary Doctrine; as the *Greek* Church doth, to whom the Council in this Decree was favourable; in paſſing the *Anathema* not on the holding ſuch an Error, but only on any one's Cenſuring the Church of Error, for holding otherwiſe. Now one, who holds an Opinion for Truth, may be highly culpable in *accuſing* thoſe, who hold the contrary, of *Error*; either, becauſe himſelf may be miſtaken in what he holds; or becauſe he may be uncharitable, or alſo diſobedient, in divulging all that he knows. (I add this in reſpect of what *Soave* Objects, about this matter, *Pag.* 755, and 709.) * See the like, *Can.* 8. and 4. —— and *Seſſ.* 21. c. 2. See likewiſe, *Seſſ.* 13. c. 11. where in reſpect that ſome approved Writers, † both Antient and Modern, (amongſt whom *Cajetan*) had held, concerning *Sacerdotal Confeſſion* to precede *Communion*, the contrary Tenent to that which the Council approved, it doth not Anathematize, or Excommunicate thoſe, who held the contrary Doctrine, as Hereticks; but Excommunicates thoſe, *qui contrarium docere, prædicare, vel pertinaceter aſſerere, ſeu etiam publicè diſputando defendere, præſumpſerint* [*i. e.* for the future]; as perturbers of the Church's peace, as *Canus*, one preſent in the Council, obſerves. ||

† See *Pallav. l.* 12. *c.* 2. *n.* 7. *n.* 12.

|| *Com. loc. l.* 5. *c.* 5.

§. 187.

So, in the *Canon* about the *Canonical* Books of *Scripture*, *Seſſ.* 4. [*Si quis pro Sacris, & Canonicis non ſuſceperit*] being only expreſſed in this Canon, and [*pari reverentiâ venerandis*] omitted, (which had ſome oppoſers *(Pall. l.* 6. *c.* 14. *n.* 3.): whilſt of the three draughts that were propoſed, † every one had ſome maintainers) no perſon ſeems, under *Anathema*, to be any further obliged, than only to hold theſe Books *Sacred*, and *Canonical:* A thing obſerved by Mr. *Thorndike*, *de Ratione finiend. Controverſias*, c. 28. p. 565. Neither yet is there any Injunction in this Council concerning the Books called *Apocryphal*, *pari reverentiâ venerandos eſſe*; but only this ſaid: *Synodus pari reverentiâ veneratur:* which hath not the *Form* of a *Decree.* Where alſo *pari reverentiâ* may be underſtood ſo, as that, whilſt in ſome reſpect, it equals theſe *Apocryphal* Books, (as the *Proteſtants* call them) with ſome of the other generally held *Canonical*; as, perhaps, with *Eſther*, *Ruth*, *Ezra*, *Nehemiah*, *Proverbs*, *Eccleſiaſtes*, &c. yet doth it not therefore, in *every* reſpect, equal them with *all*; as namely *Tobit*, or the Book of *Wiſdom*,

† See *Soave, p.* 155. -- & Bp. *Coſin's Hiſt.* of Canon, *c.* 18. §. 192.

dom, with the five Books of *Moſes*; or the four *Goſpels*. Some parts of the *Canon* being much more neceſſary and dignified, than ſome others.

And then; as for this expreſſion, equalling at leaſt thoſe Books, called *Apocryphal*, with ſome *Canonical* fore-named, and its accepting them all, as equally penn'd by the direction of the *Holy Spirit*, I ask; What new *Diſcerner* of *Spirits* will aſſume to himſelf ſo much skill, as clearly to diſcover the Language, and Character, of the Spirit in the one ſort of theſe Books, that is not in the other? For Example; in *Proverbs*, or *Eccleſiaſtes*, that is not in *Eccleſiaſticus*: Eſpecially; 1. When as, the *Church*'s Antient reading them all promiſcuouſly in her *Publick Service* for the Inſtruction of her Childern, ſhews; that ſhe held the Doctrine of them all *ſound*. 2. And, again, when as, in thoſe Books, which all ſides allow *Canonical*, yet the Holy Spirit pens them in ſo many various and unlike ſtiles; and ſome of theſe much more rude and unpoliſhed, than others; and ſpeaks ſomtimes in a much higher, ſomtimes in a much lower key; as if it condeſcended to receive a mixture with, or tincture from, the natural parts, and Elocution of its Scribe: and, only the *Truth* being entirely preſerved, admitted alſo ſomtimes his Infirmities as to Language, Method, Perſpicuity, *&c.* In which *Canon* alſo, ſome of the *Hiſtorical* Books (though preſerved from Error) ſeem not penned from immediate Divine Revelation, ſo, as the *Prophetical*; but, by uſing ſuch humane induſtry, and diligence, as other Hiſtories are compiled with. For which, ſee St. *Luke*'s Preface to his *Goſpel*. 3. And laſtly, when, as there are ſome ſeeming *Antilogies*, and Incongruities produced in the one ſort of theſe Books, called *Apocryphal*; ſo are there others, as many, as great, urged, in thoſe receiv'd by all for *Canonical*; eſpecially, in the *Hiſtorical*.

[Therefore it ſeems a great inadvertency (if nothing more) in Biſhop *Coſin* (writing ſo large a Treatiſe on this ſubject,) where he ſaith †, *---That this Council commanded all the Books recited in their Canon to be equally accepted, and taken with the ſelf ſame veneration, as having all a like Abſolute, and Divine Authority annexed to them, without preferring one before another: and damned all the Churches of the world beſides, that will not, thus, receive that Canon* [of Scripture] *upon their own terms.* Quoting in the ſame place, for juſtifying this *charge*, theſe words, as the words of the *Council*, ——*Concil. Trid. Seſſ.* 4. ——*Omnes libros pari pietatis affectu, reverentiâ, & veneratione, pro Canonicis, receperit.* —— *Ibid. Si quis autem non ſuſceperit*, &c. *Anathema ſit*; whereas there are no ſuch words, in the Council, ſo put together. ——*Si quis non ſuſceperit*, or, *receperit*, *omnes* [*hos*] *libros pari pietatis affectu, reverentiâ, & veneratione, pro Canonicis, Anathema ſit* [which words will only ſerve the deſign of his Book]; But only theſe words there uſed with relation to *Anathema*, ——*Si quis hos libros integros*, &c. pro Sacris & Canonicis *non ſuſceperit*, *Anathema ſit*. And I hope in this Decree, (as to any words or expreſſions uſed therein) ſtiling them only *Sacri & Canonici*, the Council proceeds no further in affirming any thing concerning them, than, the Biſhop will concede, the *African Council*, ‖ *Innocentius*, *Auſtin*, and other *Fathers*, to have done: and than himſelf alſo in a large ſenſe will acknowledge them to be.

§. 188.

† C. 7. §. 82.

‖ Conc. Carthag. 3. c. 47.

For,

For, he, in giving anſwer to the *Fathers*, §. 82. writes thus of them. --- *In a large and common ſenſe, as they be Books appointed to be read in the Church for the more ample direction, and inſtruction of the people,* &c.—— *(in which ſenſe that Council* [viz. of *Carthage*] *took them) or, as they are to be preferr'd before all other Eccleſiaſtical Books (in which ſenſe St.* Auſtin *took them) and as they are oppoſed to ſuppoſitions, Apocryphal and rejected Books (in which ſenſe both St.* Auſtin, *and this Council, beſides divers others of the* Fathers, *took them) all theſe ways they may be called* Canonical. Thus he. And then, for the ſenſe of theſe words; ſince he alſo advanceth thus far toward the Council's *pari pietatis affectu, ac reverentiâ ſuſcipit*, as to acknowledge——*theſe Books to have been* [as read in the Church, like as other parts of Scripture, ſo] *cited, and termed by ſundry of the Fathers*, Sacred, and Divine, and Holy Scriptures, and Prophetical Writings, † (Epithites common to theſe with other Scriptures) why may not theſe infer alſo, in a large and common ſenſe, a parity; If the Biſhop will be pleaſed to mollifie the *Council's* expreſſions ſo as he doth thoſe *Fathers?* By which Tradition and Teſtimony of the Fathers [*Othodoxorum Patrum exempla ſecuta*‖] the Council, as it ſaith, was guided in making this Decree.

† *Ibid.* §.

‖ *Conc. Trid. Seſſ.* 4. *Decret. de Canon Script.*

§. 189.

A ſecond Inadvertency of the ſame Biſhop ſeems to be, that which he urgeth much, † *of the ſmall, and inconſiderable number* [which that Council had] *to give a ſuffrage to this their Synodical Decree: and that forty Biſhops of* Italy, *aſſiſted, peradventure, with half a ſcore others, ſhould make up a* General Council *for all* Chriſtendom, *&c.* Whilſt he takes no notice, * That, by how *few* ſoever this Decree was paſſed at the firſt, yet it was afterward, by the great Body of this Council under *Pius*, Confirmed, and Ratified; and this Ratification again by the moſt of Chriſtian Churches accepted: of which ſee before, §. 72, 75, 77. And again, * That not one Book more was Voted *Sacred* and *Canonical* by theſe Fathers in *Trent*, than had been Voted before, as high as St. *Auſtin*'s times, by the *Third Council* of *Carthage:* to which St. *Auſtin*, amongſt others, ſubſcribed; and, than were, in thoſe times alſo, generally received for ſuch, in the *Weſterne* Church; and laſtly, * That, as ſeveral of theſe Books are declared *Canonical* by this *Council* after ſome *doubt*, formerly, had concerning them, ſo are others not only declared *Canonical* by *Proteſtants*, but as fully believed as the reſt, and in every reſpecte qualled with them, as *the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, the Epiſtle of St.* James, *the Second of St.* Peter, *the Second and Third of St.* John, *the Apocalypſe*, which were formerly, *viz.* till the Fourth Age, ſubject to the like *diſputes:* † and, as St. *Jerom* ‖ ſaith of one of them, —— *Paulatim, procedente tempore authoritatem obtinuerunt. Paulatim*, viz. as the *Conformity* of theſe Books with the reſt of the *Canon*, and the ſlightneſs of the Objections made againſt them, and the former Tradition, was clearlier diſcovered, after the vaniſhing of thoſe *Sects*, that chiefly oppoſed them. As therefore ſeveral pieces of the *New* Teſtament, once diſputed, have ſince been cleared, and generally received into the *Canon*, ſo may thoſe pieces of the *Old* Teſtament be, by the following *Chriſtian* Church, admitted for ſuch, though formerly rejected by the *Jewiſh*. For, though the Church's Declaration in theſe matters always depends

† *See in him* §. 194.

† See *Chemnie, Exam. Conc. Trid.* 4. *Seſſ.*

‖ *De viris illuſtribus in* Jacobo.

depends on *Tradition*, yet, not on the *Judaical Tradition*, Enemies to any Writings that favour *Chriſtianity*; (as theſe Books, we ſpeak of here, do; and ſo let them ſhut up the *Canon* of their Books Prophetical, ſtrictly ſo taken, where, and when they pleaſe); but, on that Tradition and Teſtimony, which the *Primitive* times received from the *Apoſtles* (who had the gift of *diſcerning Spirits*) concerning their Books: nor need we, for any Scripture, aſcend higher than Tradition *Apoſtolical*. In which *Apoſtle*'s times Mr. *Thorndike* (*de ration. finiend. Controverſ. p.* 545, 546.) grants, that the *Greek Copies* of theſe Books were read and peruſed, together with the reſt of the Old Teſtament-Canon, and were alluded-to in ſeveral paſſages of the *Apoſtle*'s Writings; ſome of which he there Quotes: and ſo were delivered by them, with the reſt of the *Canon*, to poſterity.——*Eas Apoſtolis lectas, & ad eas alluſum ab Apoſtolis, non eſt, cur dubium ſit*, p. 545. And —— *Non poteſt dubium videri, Helleniſtarum codicibus ſcripturas, de quibus nunc diſputamus, contineri ſolitas fuiſſe; Adeo ab ipſis Apoſtolis (quos eis uſos fuiſſe, poſita jam ſunt, quæ Argumento eſſe debeant) certatim eas Scriptores Eccleſiæ*, Scripturarum *nomine appellant*. And *Ibid.* p. 561. he grants of theſe Books. ---*Quòd, probati Apoſtolis & Eccleſiæ, ab initio legerantur, propter Doctrinam, Prophetarum ſucceſſione acceptam, non Phariſæorum* ἰθελοθρησκεία *innovatam*. Thus He. And, *Ruffinus*, in his ſecond Invective || proving the Canonicalneſs and Verity of ſome Books called *Apocryphal*, *the Hiſtory of* Suſanna, and *Hymn of the Three Children*, from the *Apoſtle*'s delivering them to the *Church*, againſt St. *Jerom*, as one, after almoſt four hundred years, denying this, and Judaizing in his Opinion, St. *Jerom*, in his latter days (*impar invidiæ, quam ſibi conflare Ruffinum videbat*; as Mr. *Thorndike* will have it †) return'd this Anſwer. *Apolog.* 2. ——*Quòd autem refero, quid adverſum Suſannæ Hiſtoriam, & Hymnum trium puerorum, & Belis Draconis fabulas, quæ in volumine Hebraico non habentur, Hebræi ſoleant dicere, qui me criminatur ſtultum ſe ſycophantam probat: Non enim, quid ipſe ſentirem, ſed quid illi contra nos dicere ſoleant, explicavi.* And ſee ſomthing ſaid by this *Father* to the ſame purpoſe (oppoſing the *Church*'s judgment to that of the *Jews*) in his Preface to *Tobit*. ——*Librum utiq; Tobiæ Hebræi de Catalogo Divinarum Scripturarum ſecantes, his, quæ Hagiographa* [or, *Apocrypha*, if you will] *memorant, manciparunt. Feci ſatis deſiderio veſtro*, (in tranſlating it) *non tamen meo ſtudio. Arguunt enim nos Hebræorum ſtudia, & imputant nobis contra ſuum* (he ſaith not, *noſtrum*) *Canonem, Latinis auribus iſta transferre. Sed melius eſſe judicans Phariſæorum diſplicere judicio, & Epiſcoporum juſſionibus deſervire, inſtiti, ut potui*, &c. And, again, in his Preface to *Judith*; —— *Apud Hebræos liber Judith inter Hagiographa* (or if you will, *Apocrypha*) *legitur*, &c. *Sed quia, hunc librum Synodus* Nicena *in numero S. Scripturarum, legitur, computaſſe, acquievi poſtulationi veſtræ*, &c. To all theſe I grant Biſhop *Coſin* makes Replies; || but I think ſuch, as will appear to the Reader, that well weighs them, unſatisfactory, as to the making St. *Jerom* conſtantly maintain all theſe Books to be in the ſame manner excluded from the *Canon* by the *Church*, as they were by the *Jews*.

|| *Apud Hieron. tom.* 9.

† *Ibid.p.*561

|| See *p.* 81, &c.

A third Inadvertancy of the ſame Author ſeems to be, That, from the *Anathema* joined to their Decree, and from *Pius* his Declaration, touch- §190.

ing the new Creed he impoſed; ——*Hæc eſt Fides, extra quam non eſt ſalus,* the Biſhop argues often. † ——*That this Decree is made by this Council no leſs a neceſſary Article of the Chriſtian Faith, than that* God *is the Creator of Heaven and Earth; or, that* Chriſt *was born of the Bleſſed* Virgin, *&c.* Contrary to which ſee what is ſaid below, §. 192, and 194, *&c.*

† *See in him* §. 198.

§. 191.

A fourth Inadvertancy of the ſame Biſhop is in reference to that *rule* given by St. *Auſtin*, || for knowing what Books are by us to be held *Canonical*, ſet down in his Sect. 81. *viz.* ——*In Canonicis Scripturis Eccleſiarum Catholicarum quamplurium* [but the Biſhop ſets it down, *quamplurimum*] *authoritatem ſequatur.* Which Rule the Biſhop ſeemeth there to approve, and commend, and yet, ſince this *Rule* is no more proper, or applicable, to the Church's Authority, or Guidance of its Subjects, in St. *Auſtin*'s Age, than in any other, precedent, or ſubſequent; from hence it will follow, That the *Biſhop* is to receive theſe Books *now* as *Canonical*, becauſe they are by the *moſt*, and *moſt* dignified Churches of *God*, received as ſuch; and he knows, that no Book is therefore juſtly excluded from the *Canon*, becauſe it hath been ſomtimes heretofore doubted of. Excuſe this Digreſſion, by which perhaps you may perceive, that this Biſhop had no juſt cauſe to raiſe ſo great a quarrel, againſt ſo great a Council, out of this matter. ⌋

|| *De Doctr. Chriſt. l.* 1. *c.* 8.

§. 192.

7.

Seventhly, That the *contrary* to ſuch Propoſitions, the maintainers whereof are Anathematized, as Hereticks, is not hereby made by the Council an Article of Faith in ſuch a ſenſe, 1 As if it were made a *Divine Truth*, or a matter, or object, of our Faith; or the contrary Doctrine to it, made againſt *Faith*; or the matter of *Hereſie*, *now*, which was not *formerly*. 2 Or, as if ſuch *Divine Truth* were not alſo revealed, and declared to be ſo formerly, either in the ſame *Expreſſion*, and Concluſion, or in its neceſſary *Principles*. 3 Or, as if any ſuch thing were now neceſſary *explicitly* to be known, or believed abſolutely, *Ratione Medii*, for attaining *Salvation*, which was not ſo formerly: 4 Or yet, as if there might not be ſuch a *ſufficient propoſal* made to us of ſuch Point formerly, as that, from this, we had then an obligation to believe it: 5 Or yet, as if the ignorance of ſuch point, before the *Definition* of a Council, might not be ſome *loſs* in order to our *Salvation*, and this our ignorance of it, then alſo, culpable. But, that ſuch Point is made, by the *Council*'s defining it, an *Article*, or Object of our *Faith*, now neceſſary to be believed in ſome degree of *neceſſity* (wherein it was not before) by reaſon of a more *evident* propoſal thereof, when the *Council* (whoſe judgment we are bound to believe, and ſubmit to) declares it a Divine Truth; or alſo now firſt delivers that Point of Faith more *expreſly* in the *Concluſion*, which was before involved, and known only to the Chriſtian World, in its *Principles*. By which *evident* Definition of the Council (though the *Doctrine* oppoſing ſuch Point of Faith was before *Heretical*, or *matter* of Hereſie, yet) the maintainer thereof now firſt by his pertinacy againſt the Church's Authority, begins to be an *Heretick*. † And though the ignorance of ſuch Point of Faith before might bring ſome dammage as to our Salvation, yet now doth it more, when a contrary *error* begins to corrupt our *practice*. I ſay, ſuch Point begins to be *neceſſary*, in a new Degree of neceſſity, to be believed

† See *Diſc.* 3. §. 18.

believed or assented to; or, not to be dissented from, or denied; or, not the contrary of it to be believ'd, so soon, as we have had a *sufficient proposal* of the Council's defining it. And *necessary* it is then to be *believed*, not out of an obligation, or duty of *belief* we owe to such a *Credend*, as that, without beliving it, we cannot attain Salvation; but out of the duty of *obedience* we owe to the *Church*, when defining it, as that, without yielding this obedience to Her, we become guilty of such a sin, as, un-repented of, ruines Salvation. Especially, when as this our *Holy Mother* doth not enjoine to us the belief of such a Divine Truth, but upon some *considerable Motive*; for the repelling and suppressing of some Error, that is; (less, or more) dangerous; and for the preservation of some part of necessary Truth, or good Life. Concerning which *Proposals*, the *Church*'s pronouncing *Anathema* to the non-Submitters seems secur'd as by Antient practice, so by our *Lord*'s order, *Matth.* 18. 17. *He that will not hear the Church, let him be to us as an Heathen*; though, otherwise, the pure *nescience* of such a Doctrine, abstracting from such Proposal, harms no Man, as to exclusion from Salvation, any more after the Church's *Definition*, than, before it. See what hath been said of this matter in the third *Disc.* §. 18.-- and §. 85. *n.* 6.

§. 193.

Thus (to express, if I can, yet more clearly, though with some repetitions, a thing, whereat so many of the *Reformed*, and those not of the meanest sort, seem to stumble, and take offence) an *Article* of *Faith*, as to a more universal *Proposal* of it, and general obligation to *believe* it so sufficiently proposed, may be said *new*: and then, in respect of this *new* Declaration, and Obligation, a Divine Truth may be an Article, or Object of my Faith, to day, which was not yesterday: So he, who (by what means so ever) knows now, that somthing is said in *Scripture*, which he knew not yesterday, may be said to have to day a new Article of his Faith; or a new Point, no way to be opposed, or denied, but assented to, and believed, by him.

1 When therefore, a thing is said to be no *Dogma Fidei* before, and at such a time to begin to be so, the meaning is, either, that in such *express* terms it is so *now*, as it was not *formerly* (by some fuller Explication, or new Deduction): Or, that it is now rendred necessary to be believed by *all* persons, by whom it was not so formerly, for want, then, of so *evident* a Proposal. 2 Again, when a Point is said thus to be rendred by the Definition of a Council necessary to be believed, which was not so formerly: It is meant; *necessary to be believed*; not, for the matter thereof. Either, First, As if the actual Knowledge, and Faith thereof were absolutely necessary to Salvation, at all; or now, more than formerly. For, thus a few Points only (some think, not all those of the *Apostle*'s *Creed*) are necessary; and nothing is, thus, necessary at any time, that is not so always. Or, Secondly, As if the actual knowledge thereof is beneficial to our Salvation now, and was not so at all formerly. For, as it is now perhaps beneficial in more respects; so, in some respects, was it always; and therefore, if we knew it not before, so much imperfection there was then in our Faith,

as to ſomthing revealed; though, not a deficiency thereof in abſolutely neceſſaries. But, *neceſſary to be believed* now more than formerly, *ex accidenti*; becauſe, Firſt, We have a ſufficient *Propoſal* thereof, by the *Church-Definition*, now, that it is a Divine Truth: which Propoſal perhaps we had not before in ſo expreſs terms, and ſo univerſally diſcovered by the former Tradition: And, Secondly, Becauſe we have alſo a ſufficient propoſal, or notice, that ſuch a Definition hath been made by the *Church*. And ſo, in not believing it, we are now defective in our *obedience*, and *acceptance* of ſome *Divine Truth*, which is made known to us by the Church, as ſome way *profitable* to our *Salvation*; ſome way advantagious to God's *Glory*; ſome way conducible to *Chriſtian Edification*, to the *peace* of the Church, and *ſuppreſſion* of *Hereſie*, or, to ſome other good end. By whoſe Definitions from time to time the Rule of our Faith is made ſtill *more compleat*, and *conſpicuous*, both as to the Regiſtring, and ſolemn Inrolling of her former Traditions: and as to the expreſs Knowledge of ſeveral Conſequences neceſſarily iſſuing from the former Principles of the Chriſtian Belief: *more compleat*, I ſay, to the end of the world, as to ſeveral Points, in ſome reſpect, or other, beneficial to be known: Though, from the firſt, the *Chriſtian Faith* was ever *perfect*, as to any knowledge ſimply neceſſary; or alſo, as to all that were Fundamentally uſeful. And therefore the chief Duty, that the *Church* now requires to many of her Deciſions made from time to time, as counter-works againſt Hereticks, and extracted always out of the former Materials of Original Traditions, is not ſo much an actual knowing of them for every Chriſtian (though this alſo She deſires, as eſteeming the knowledge of them ſome way contributing to Chriſtian perfection;) but, that they be not *diſſented* from, or *oppoſed*, when made known to him; and that the *Contradictory* of them be not believed by Him.

§. 194. As for the *profeſſion* of the *Roman* Faith required in the *Bull* of *Pius*, wherein are ſaid to be Twelve new Articles added to the *Apoſtolical*: I wonder why they ſay not Twelve ſcore, or a 1200. rather, for if it adds any, it adds *omnia à S. Tridentinâ Synodo, & ab Oecumenicis Concilies, & à ſacris Canonibus tradita, definita & declarata*, as it runs in the ſame *Bull*, though it expreſſeth only ſome few of them.

1. 1. All the order that the Council of *Trent* gave concerning this *Profeſſion* of *Faith*, was; ——*Seſſ.* 24. *de Reform. cap.* 12. ——*Proviſi etiam de beneficiis, teneantur Orthodoxæ ſuæ fidei, publicam facere profeſſionem; & in Romanæ Eccleſiæ Obedientiâ ſe permanſuros ſpondeant.* So that, *Hæc eſt Catholica fides, extra quam nemo ſalvus*, is a Declaration of the *Pope*, not of the *Council*; nor can it have any more authority, than other *Papal* Decrees.

2. 2. And again, what ever profeſſion of Faith is made in that *Bull*; or, if it oblige further, therein, than the *Canons* of the Councils do bind; yet it concerneth not any perſons, ſave thoſe who enter into *Religious Orders*, or into ſome Eccleſiaſtical *Benefice*, as appears in the Preface.

§ 195. n. 1. 3. 3. Theſe perſons are not therein obliged to believe the *Articles*, or *Canons* of *Trent*, or, of other Councils in any other ſenſe, than that which ‡ §. 192. we have but now mentioned. ‡ For that *Clauſe* in the *Bull* which follows the

the whole profeſſion,——*Hæc vera Catholica fides, extra quam nemo ſalvus eſſe poteſt*, cannot be underſtood *diſtributively*, in ſuch a manner, as if every *Canon* of every Lawful Council is neceſſary *explicitly* to be known, and aſſented to, that any one may attain *Salvation*; which few *Roman* Doctors will affirm of all the Articles of the Apoſtles Creed; much leſs do they ſay it of every Point whatever of their Faith. (See *Bellarmin de Eccleſiâ l.* 3. *c.* 14.——*Multa ſunt de fide, quæ non ſunt abſolutè neceſſaria ad ſalutem*; I add, nor yet is the ignorance or miſtaking in ſome of them ſuch an Error, *ex quo magnum aliquod malum oriatur*): But either * it is to be underſtood *collectively*, *In hac Profeſſione continetur vera Catholica Fides*, &c. that all the *fides extra quam nemo ſalvus*, is contained in that Profeſſion: (which expreſſion reſpects chiefly the *Apoſtles*, or *Nicene*, Creed, ſet in the front of the profeſſion; as appears by a like expreſſion [*Fundamentum firmum & unicum*] applied to that *Creed* alone, in *Conc. Trident.* 3*d. Seſſ.*) For if only ſome part of that Profeſſion of Faith, which is made in that *Bull*, be abſolutely neceſſary to attaining Salvation, this phraſe is ſufficiently juſtified *extra quam* [*i. e. totam, i. e.* if all parts of it be disbelieved] *non eſt ſalus*. As ſaying; [That the Holy *Scriptures* are the *Word of God*, without believing which there is no Salvation,] argues not, that *every* thing delivered in theſe *Scriptures*, is neceſſary to be believed for Salvation, but that *ſome* things are. Or, * It is to be underſtood *diſtributively*, but this *conditionally*; in ſuch a ſenſe, as, *extra quam nemo ſalvus eſſe poteſt*, *i. e.* if ſuch perſon oppoſeth, or denieth aſſent to, any point therein, when ſufficiently evidenced to him to be a *Definition of the Church* infallibly aſſiſted, and appointed his Guide in Divine Truths. †† For, in his ſo doing, though the Error ſhould be in a ſmaller matter of Faith, he becomes therein obſtinate, and Heretical, and diſobedient to his Spiritual *Guide*, declared by the *Scriptures* infallible in all neceſſaries: and ſo, in this, becomes guilty of a *mortal ſin*: which unrepented-of, exludes from Salvation. Where alſo, ſince the *Church* makes Definitions in Points abſolutely *neceſſary*; hence though all her Definitions are not in ſuch, yet his *obſtinacy*, in not yielding aſſent to all matters defined, runs a hazzard of failing in ſomthing *neceſſary*.

†† See before §. 192.

[And well may *Proteſtants* admit ſuch a ſenſe of theſe words in *Pius* his *Bull*, when themſelves make uſe of a much *larger* upon the like words in the *Athanaſian* Creed: [*Hæc eſt fides Catholica, quam niſi quiſq; fideliter crediderit, ſalvis eſſe non poterit*]. Which words being urged by a *Catholick* againſt Archbiſhop *Laud* to ſhew; That ſome Points may become neceſſary, for Salvation, to be believed, when once *defined* by the Church, that yet are not abſolutely ſo neceſſary, or fundamental, according to the Importance of the *matter*: All the Points contained in the *Creed* being not held in this latter ſenſe ſo Fundamental, or neceſſary, *ratione Medii*, to Salvation, that none can poſſibly attain it without an explicit Belief of them: Here a late *Proteſtant* Writer, † in Anſwer to this, can find out a ſenſe of thoſe words yet more remiſs, than that we have now given, *viz.* That, as to ſome of the *Athanaſian* Articles, [*Hæc eſt fides Catholica*, &c.] neither infers, that they are neceſſary to be believed from the *matter*; nor yet from *Church-Definition*: §. 195. *n.* 2.

† *Stilling f.* *P.* 70, 71.

nition: but neceſſary only, if there be firſt a *clear conviction* (*i. e.* not from *Church-Authority*, but from *Scripture*) that they are *Divine Revelation.* Where the Authority of the *Church*, in defining theſe Matters of the *Athanaſian Creed*, as to any Obligation of her Subjects to conform to it, ſeems quite laid aſide: ſince, upon a *clear Conviction*, that thoſe Articles are *Divine Revelation* from whatever Proponent, one ſtands obliged to believe them; and, without ſuch *Conviction*, neither ſtands he ſo obliged by the *Church.* Upon which Account the *Socinian* is freed here by his Expoſition, from the—— *Quam niſi quiſque fideliter*, &c. becauſe he is not yet *convinced* of the *Truth* of this Faith by *Scripture.* Since *Proteſtants*, then, take ſuch Liberty in expounding the Senſe of this Concluſion of the *Athanaſian Articles*, it is but reaſon, that they ſhould allow the ſame to the ſameWords uſed by *Pius.*]

§. 196. 4. *Laſtly*, If theſe Words of *Pius* ſhould be taken in ſuch a Senſe, as *Proſtants* fetter them with: Namely,——*That the* Roman *Church hereby obtrudes her new-coined Articles, as abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation:* As Biſhop *Bramhal.* || *Which, whether true or falſe, one is to ſwear to, as much as to his* Creed: As Mr. Thorndike. †. *That, whereas the Church of* England *only Excommunicates ſuch, as ſhall affirm, That her Articles are in any part erroneous; the ſame Church never declaring, that every one of her Articles are fundamental in the Faith; by the Church of* Rome *every one of them, if that Church hath once determined them, is made fundamental, and that in every Part of it, to all Men's Belief:* As Biſhop *Laud.* || *That, ſuppoſing the Church's Definition* [once paſſed] *that thing ſo propounded becomes as neceſſary to Salvation,* [*i. e.* by this Propoſal, or Definition] as *what is neceſſary from the Matter:* And,——*That an equal explicit Faith is required to the Definitions of the* Church, *as to the Articles of the* Creed: *And that there is an* equal *Neceſſity, in order to Salvation, of believing both of them:* As Mr. *Stillingfleet.* †. If, I ſay, *Pius* his [*Hæc, eſt Fides Catholica*] muſt be taken in ſuch a Senſe: and then, it be conſidered alſo; that, by the *Bull*, this Clauſe is applied not only to the *Articles* expreſly mentioned in it, but to all *other Definitions* alſo of all other *former* allowed *Councils:* The Conſequent is; that in this *Bull* the *Pope* hath excluded from Salvation, and that for want of neceſſary *Faith*, the far greater Part not only of *Chriſtians*, but of *Roman Catholicks*; *viz.* All, that do not explicitly believe, and therefore, that do not actually know, *every* particular Definition of *any* Precedent *Council*; when as, who is there among the *Vulgar*, that is not ignorant of the *moſt* of them? who amongſt the *Learned*, that knows them *all?* Now, the very Abſurdity of ſuch a Tenent, might make them ſuſpect the Integrity of their Comment on thoſe Words; and, that they only declaim againſt their own Fancies. When as, indeed; to render any Point, after defined, neceſſary explicitly to be believed, not only this one Condition of the *Church*'s having defined them, is required (for, none is obliged neceſſarily to believe *explicitly*, what-ever the *Church* hath defined) but a ſecond alſo, of a ſufficient *Propoſal*, made to us, of the *Church*'s having defined them. And then indeed, ſo many Articles are neceſſary to be explicitly believed, as to the doing of our *Duty* in order to our Salvation; but not all of them neceſſary

4. || *Rep.* to *Chalced.* p. 322. † *Epilog. Concluſ.* p. 410. ‖ §. 15. p. 51. † *Rat. Account*, p. 48.

ry to be believed, as to acquiring some *knowledge* necessary to our Salvation, without which Knowledge it could not be had, as that of some of the *Articles* of the *Creed* is. See what hath been already said of this whole Matter, much what to this purpose, in *Disc.* 3. §. 8. *n.* 4. &c.

§. 197. There are, then, (as *Catholicks*, to undeceive *Protestants*, do frequently inculcat, and cannot be heard) *Points*, or *Articles* of *Faith*, necessary to our *Salvation* to be believed; or, *extra quæ credita nemo salvus*, in a triple Sense.

1. First, Some necessary *ratione Medii:* Such as are necessary so absolutely, as that an invincible Ignorance of them is said to fail of *Salvation*; which are a very *few* of the many *Articles* of our *Christian Faith.*

2. Secondly, Others necessary *ratione præcepti*; which are necessary to be believed, only *conditionally:* And they are of two sorts. (1.) Either *such*, which I am not only obliged to *believe*, when known to me to be *Divine Truths*, but the *Knowledge* also of which, as *Articles* of high Concernment, I am bound, according to the different Quality of my Condition, to seek after; wherein my *Ignorance* and *Neglect*, when by using a due Diligence I might have known them, being thus in an high degree culpable, doth, unrepented-of, destroy my *Salvation.* Such are some other chief *Principles* of *Religion* and *Piety*, the *Ten Commandments*, and some *Sacraments*, &c. delivered in the common *Creeds*, and *Catechisms*; such as are not absolutely necessary, *ratione Medii.*

3. Thirdly, Or (2.) *Such*, as, though I am not obliged to such a diligent *search* of them, as of the former; yet a *Belief* of them I am to embrace, so often as these two things precede: 1*st.* That they are defined by my Spiritual Guides, to be *Divine Revelation:* And, 2*ly.* That this Definition is sufficiently evidenced to me. Where, though not my meer Ignorance in such Points, yet my Denial or Dis-belief of them thus proposed, is to be judged wilful, and obstinate; and this, unrepented-of, destroys my Salvation.

§. 198. 8. *Eighthly*, This of the *Seventh.* The *Eighth Consideration* is: That the *most* or *chiefest* of the *Protestant* Controversies, defined, or made, *de Fide*, in the *Council* of *Trent*, (to repeat here what hath been said formerly in the First *Disc.* §. 50.) were made so by *former Councils* of equal Obligation; or also were contained in the publick *Liturgies* of the *Church Catholick.*——As: *The Lawfulness of Communion in one kind*, declared in the *Council* of *Constance.* *Canon of Scripture*; *Purgatory*; *Seven Sacraments*; *The Pope's Supremacy*; in the *Council* of *Florence.* *Auricular Confession*; *Transubstantiation:* in the *Council* of *Lateran.* *Veneration of Images*; in the Second *Nicene Council.* —— *Adoration of* Christ's *Body and Blood, as present in the Eucharist*; in the *Council* of *Francfort*, (if the *Capitulare Caroli* may be taken to deliver the Sense of that *Council.*†) *Veneration of the Cross*, ‖ *and of Relicks*; † in the same *Council:* [Only this *Council* condemned the *Adoration of Images* in such a Sense, as they mistook the Second *Council* of *Nice* to have allowed it.‖] *Monastick Vows*; *Celibacy of Clergy*; sufficiently Authorized in the Four first *General*

† See *Capitulare.* l. 2. c. 27.---c. 5.---‖ *Ib.* l. 4. c. 16.---† *Ib.* l. 3. c. 24.---‖ See *Capitulare Precil.*---Dr. *Francfort.*---*fat.*-----Dr. *Hammond of Schism.*---*Thorndi. Epi-log.* l. 3. p. 363.

General-Councils. Invocation of Saints; Prayer for the Dead; Sacrifice of the Mass: and many other, apparent in the Publick *Liturgies* of the *Church*, preceding the *Council* of *Trent*, and unaltered for many Ages, (*Protestants* being Judges.) Now, the *Church* obligeth her Subjects to *believe* all those things *lawful*, which, in her *Liturgies*, she obligeth them to *practise:* And, why was there made a Departure from the *Church* for these Points, before the *Council* of *Trent*, if the *Church* before made them not *de Fide*; or if the *Council* of *Trent*, or *Pius* the IV. were first faulty herein? But if other *Councils*, before *Trent*, have defined such things, then by *these* first were all Hopes of Peace, except by yielding to their Decrees, cut off, and not by *Trent*; because these *Councils* are by the *Roman Church* accepted, and held obligatory, as well as that of *Trent*. And here I may repeat those Words of Bishop *Bramhal*, (recited in *Disc.* 1. §. 52.) in Answer to the Bishop of *Chalcedon*, who urged the *Separation* of *Protestants* from the *Church*, long before the *Grievances* of *Trent*, or *Pius*. ——*These very Points* (saith † *p.* 263. he †) *which* Pius *the Fourth comprehended in a new Symbol, or* Creed, *were obtruded on us before by his Predecessors*, [*i. e.* then, when *Luther* and his Followers forsook the *Church*] *as necessary Articles of the* Roman Faith; *and required, as necessary Articles of their Communion:* ——*This is the only Difference, that* Pius *the Fourth dealt in gross, his Predecessors by retail. They fashioned the several Rods, and he bound them up in a bundle. They fashioned the Rods, i. e.* in the *Synods* held in the *Church*, before *Luther*'s Appearance. For, these *Rods* only require Submittance, as being *necessary Articles of her Communion*; and such are only the Definitions of her *Councils*.

§. 199. 9. *Ninthly*, Consider, That the *Protestants*, who accuse, seem as guilty in making *new Definitions* in Matters of Faith, and enjoining them to be *believed*, or *assented*, and subscribed to, by those of their Communion, as the Council of *Trent*, or *Roman Church*, that is here taxed for it. For, as the one is said to make new *Affirmatives* in Religion, so the other, new *Negatives*; † §. 85. *n.* 2. all, or most of which (as hath been shewed in the Third *Disc. c.* 7. †) are *implicitly* new Affirmatives.

§. 200. 1. Neither can the *Church* of *Rome* be more justly questioned in her not leaving Points in *Universals* only, and their former Indifferency; but anew-stating *Purgatory*, *Transubstantiation*, *Invocation*, &c. than the *Reformed*, and particularly those of the *English Church* for the new-stating the *contrary* to these. 1. Who (as hath been shewed, in the Third *Disc. c.* 7. †) do not † §. 85. *n.* 3. *suspend* their Judgment concerning those *new Points*, which, they say, the *Roman Church* presumes to determine; but do, in the main Articles handled in the Council of *Trent*, as peremptorily state the one side, as the *Roman Church*, the other: And, as to several Points, the *Reformed* also were the *first*, I mean, in comparison of the Council of *Trent*, in *determining* them; and condemning the Doctrines and Practises of the other side. So (to say nothing here of the *Augustan Confession*, composed many Years before the sitting of this *Council*, and condemning most of the Points; which this justifies) *the Sacrifice of the Mass*, *Communion in one kind*, *Invocation of Saints*, *Veneration of Images*, *Purgatory*, *Indulgences*, and some others, were con-

condemned and declared to be againſt God's Word by the *Articles* of the *Church* of *England* many years, before the ſame were either impoſed to be ſworn to by *Pius*, or defended, and juſtified by the *Articles* of *Trent*; the one done in 1549. the other in 1562. 2ly. Who leave as litle *liberty* to their Subjects to hold the *Roman* tenents, as the *Roman* Church doth, to hold their's: For, as the *Roman* Church doth *Anathematize* thoſe, who affirm the contrary to her Articles, to be true, ſo doth the *Church* of *England*, in the Synod held under King *James*, 1603. *Can.* 5. *excommunicate* thoſe, that affirm any of her *Articles* to be *erroneous*: and for this Church's requiring alſo not only an external *non-contradiction*, but internal *aſſent*, I deſire you to weigh the proofs produced in the 3*d*. *Diſc. c.* 7. † whither, to avoid repetitions, I remit you. 2. † §. 83. *n.* 1.

And, if we look into the *Proteſtant* Churches abroad, we find the *National Synod* of *Dort*, aſſembled, *A. D.* 1618. touching ſome differences among their Divines in thoſe high, and dark points of *Divine Predeſtination*, Co-operation of *Grace*, and *Freewill*, &c. where were preſent alſo ſome Divines ſent from all the other *Proteſtant*-Churches following the Doctrine of *Calvin* (except the *French*); We find it, I ſay, in thoſe five Points, * to have paſſed, partly in aſſerting *Truths*, partly in condemning *Errors*, no leſs than 91 *Articles*, or *Canons*. (What might their Canons have amounted to; had they diſcuſſed ſo many points of Controverſie, as that of *Trent* did?) And then, * to enjoin all the Paſtors their Subjects the teaching to the people of theſe Truths [and therefore the believing of them]; and * to excommunicate all thoſe holding the contrary, as Corrupters of the Truth, till they ſhall give ſatisfaction to the Church, in profeſſing the true Doctrine. The words of the Synod, *Seſſ.* 138. are theſe, —— *Synodus hæc* Dordrechtana, *pro authoritate, quam ex Dei verbo in omnia Eccleſiarum ſuarum membra obtinet in Chriſti nomine injungit omnibus, & ſingulis in* Fœderato Belgio *Eccleſiarum Paſtoribus*, &c. *ut hanc ſacram veritatis ſalutaris doctrinam* [*viz.* that delivered in the 91. Articles concerning the five Points in Controverſie] *ſinceram & inviolatam, conſervent*; *illam populo & juventuti fideliter proponant, & explicent*, &c. [which publick teaching of them requir'd, includes aſſent to them.] Then againſt the *Remonſtrants* pronounceth thus,——*Synodus, ſuæ Authoritatis ex verbo Dei probe conſcia, omnium legitimarum tum veterum, tum recentiorum, Synodorum veſtigiis inſiſtens, declarat atque judicat, Paſtores illos*, &c. [the *Remonſtrant* Miniſters] *corruptæ Religionis, & ſciſſæ Eccleſiæ unitatis reos teneri. Quas ob cauſas, Synodus prædictis, omni eccleſiaſtico munere, interdicit, eiſque ab officiis ſuis abdicat, donec per ſeriam reſipiſcentiam, dictis, factis, ſtudiis contrariis, comprobatam, eccleſiæ ſatisfaciant, atque ad ejus communionem recipiantur.* Then orders, —— *Ut Synodi Provinciales neminem ad ſacrum Miniſterium admittant, qui doctrinæ, hiſce Synodicis conſtitutionibus declaratæ, ſubſcribere, eamque docere, recuſet.*

Only this main *difference* there is between theſe two Churches: That the one requires *aſſent* to her Articles, telling her Subjects, that in *neceſſaries* ſhe cannot err: the other requires *aſſent*, declaring to her followers that ſhe may err, even in points Neceſſary: The one requires *aſſent* in obedience to her *Authority*, delegated to her by our Lord: the other ſeems to require *aſſent* only from the *Evidence* (in *Scripture*, or otherwiſe) of the *matter* propoſed. §. 201.

posed. Therefore so many of her Subjects, as see not such *Evidence*, in equity, methinks, should be freed from her exacting their *assent*. And then, such obligation to assent would fail of it's end, expressed before her Articles, *viz.* —— *the hindring diversity of Opinions, and the establishing of consent touching true Religion.*

§. 202. 10. Lastly, to shut up all; whatever *offence*, either this strict *Profession* of *Faith* summ'd up by *Pius*, or *Anathemas* multiplied by the Council of *Trent*, may have given to the *Reformed*; yet neither the one, nor the other, can justly be charged to have given *occasion* to their *discession*, and *rent* from the former *Catholick Church*. Which Division, and (as I have shewed †) their Censure also of the *Roman* Doctrines, preceded both the times of *Pius*, and the sitting of this Council: and, on the contrary, their *Departure*, and such *Censure*, first occasioned the Church's standing upon her *Defence*, and the setting up these new *Fences* and *Bars*, for preservation of her ancient Doctrine invaded by them, and for hindring her sheep from straggling out of her fold, and hearkning after the voice of Strangers.

10.

† §. 200.

CHAP.

CHAP. XII.

V. Head. *Of the Decrees of this Council concerning* Reformation.

1. *In matters, concerning the* Pope *and Court of* Rome.
   1. *Appeals*, §. 212. *and Diſpenſations*, §. 215. 2. *Collation of Benefices.* §. 218. 3. *Penſions.* §. 218. *Commendams*, §. 219. *and Uniting of Benefices.* §. 220. 4. *Exemptions.* §. 221. 5. *Abuſes concerning Indulgences, and Charities given to Pious uſes.* §. 223.

2. *In matters concerning the Clergy.*
   1. *Unfit perſons many times admitted into Holy Orders, and Benefices.* §. 225. 2. *Pluralities.* §. 232. 3. *Non-Reſidence.* §. 235. 4. *Neglect of Preaching and Catechiſing:* §. 236. *And the Divine Service not in the Vulgar Tongue.* §. 236. *n.* 2. 5. *Their reſtraint from Marriage; and Incontinency in Cœlibacy.* §. 238, 239. 6. *Their with-holding from the people the Communion of the Cup.* §. 241. 7. *Too frequent uſe of Excommunication.* §. 243. *n.* 1. 8. *The many diſorders in* Regulars *and* Monaſticks. §. 243. *n.* 2. 9. *Several defects in the* Miſſals *and* Breviaries. §. 243. *n.* 3.

THus much (from, §. 173.) of the 4*th.* Head, Concerning the *multitude* §. 203.
of the *Canons*, *Definitions*, and *Anathemas*, of this Council, in points ——
of Doctrine. The fifth ſucceeds; touching the Acts for *Reformation* of ſeveral corruptions, and diſorders in the Church's Government, and Diſcipline; which was ſo much petitioned for by Chriſtian Princes; and alſo, from its firſt ſitting, undertaken by this Council; But, *with ſuch a contrary, and unexpected iſſue* (ſaith Soave †), *That this Council, being managed by Princes for Reformation of Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline, hath cauſed the greateſt Deformation, that ever was ſince Chriſtianity did begin; and hoped for by the Biſhops to regain the Epiſcopal Authority, uſurped for the moſt part by the* Pope, *hath made them loſe it altogether, bringing them into greater Servitude; on the contrary, feared and avoided by the* See *of* Rome, *as a potent means to moderate the exorbitant power, mounted, from ſmall beginnings, by divers degrees, unto an unlimitted exceſs, it hath ſo eſtabliſhed, and confirmed the ſame over that part, which remaineth ſubject unto it, that it was never ſo great, nor ſo ſoundly rooted.* Thus he. † *l.* 1. *p.* 2.
To which may be added the like paſſage in Mr. *Stillingfleet*, † I ſuppoſe, † *Rat. Ac.*
from this Hiſtorian's Detractions too confidently followed, who tells his *count. p.* 480.
Readers, —— *That the Pope was ſtill in a bodily fear, till the Council was ended to his mind; But then, what rejoycing, that they had cheated the world ſo, that that which was intended to clip the wings of the Court of* Rome, *had confirmed, and advanced the Intereſt of it!*

§. 204. But I ſuppoſe, it will be ſufficient, in anſwer to both, to give you the Confeſſions of the ſame *Soave*, in the latter end of his Hiſtory, to make appear, how untruly theſe things are ſaid, in the beginning. For, after the *Council* now ended, and a Confirmation deſired from the *Pope* of theſe it's acts, the authority of Biſhops was found to be ſo much enlarged by the Council; and the former exerciſe of the *Pope*'s Authority (though all done with a *Salva authoritate Apoſtolicæ ſedis*) ſo much pared; the privileges of the *Cardinals*, and gains of the *Court* of *Rome*, by the reſtraints of Appeals, of Diſpenſations, of Pluralities, of Non-Reſidence, Exemptions, Penſions, Elections, *&c.* ſo much diminiſhed; that the *Pope*, (though of himſelf much inclined to a General *Confirmation*,) with his *Cardinals*, and Court, is related by *Soave*, to have, long time, deliberated: whether the Articles *of Faith* only ſhould be accepted, and confirmed; and thoſe *of Reformation* rejected, or moderated.

To give you theſe things rather in his own words; which may ſerve as an Antidote to the former. *l.* 8. *p.* 814. He ſaith, —— *That the* Court, *underſtanding that the* Pope *was reſolved for the Confirmation, changed their joy into grief; and all the Officers complained of the loſs they ſhould receive in their Offices, if that reformation were executed.* —— *That Supplications alſo, and Memorials, were given to the* Pope *by thoſe, who, having bought their Offices, and foreſeeing this loſs, demanded Reſtitution.* —— *That the* Pope, *having diligently conſidered hereof, deputed eight* Cardinals *to conſult upon the Confirmation; and to think upon ſome remedy for the complaints of the* Court. —— *That theſe* Cardinals *were almoſt all of opinion, that it was fit they ſhould be moderated before the Confirmation.* —— *And that it was certain, that they, who did procure the Council, had no aim but to pull down the* Pope*'s authority; and while the Council did laſt, every one did ſpeak, as if It had power to give laws unto him.* [Where you ſee what freedom the Council took]. —— *At laſt, that, ſatisfied with two ſpeeches, the one of Cardinal* Amulius, *the other of* Hugo Buoncampagno, *perſwading him, and the Court; that, by diſpenſing with its acts, or giving what interpretations to them he pleaſed, he might provide for his Miniſters, and Servants, and accommodate things to that which might be for the benefit of the Church, without violating the Decrees of the Council, becauſe in them the* Apoſtolick *authority is ſtill reſerved; the* Pope *proceeded to confirm them entirely.*

§. 205. To verifie ſome part of which Relation of *Soave* concerning the reluctance of the *Pope*'s Court (not without great cauſe, if an eye may be had only to Gain,) I may add, what *Pallavicino*, writing but the other day, and well acquainted with the preſent ſtate thereof, relates concerning it: † —— *That, as to* Favours *and* Diſpenſations, *formerly granted from the* Apoſtolick See, *this Council hath ſo far moderated the uſe of them, that, if the* Pope *will obſerve theſe laws, the fountain of his beneficence is dried up, for one half: And, that, although he hath ſtill a power to diſpenſe with theſe laws, yet the* Popes, *for their Conſcience, and Honour ſake, require for the moſt part ſuch preſſing Motives, and ſo rarely happening, of doing this, that their Conceſſions in ſuch matters, as are prohibited by the Council, do not amount to the 20th. part of thoſe formerly accuſtomed. And that the ſame thing alſo happens, * in the* Cauſes pri-

† *Introduct. c.* 10.

mæ

mæ inſtantiæ (as they phraſe it) *that are brought to the Court of* Rome: *And* * *In thoſe* privileges, *or exemptions, by which many particular perſons withdrew themſelves from the Juriſdiction of Biſhops; which was no leſs, than rendring many the immediate Subjects of the Tribunals of the* Pope; *and finally,* * *in all thoſe* affairs, *concerning which the Council grants power to the Biſhops, that they ſhall proceed in them, as* Delegates of the Apoſtolick See; *which, as to the advancing of the Biſhops power, amounts to the ſame, as if they diſpatched them* [in their own right] *without any ſuch formality.* Thus he. And again, *l.* 23. *c.* 12. *n.* 5. † *l.* 8. *p.* 792. To *Soave,* † objecting: That the leaving the cognition, and termination of ſeveral cauſes to the Biſhop's Tribunals, without any more Appeals to *Rome,* ordered in the 20th Chapter of *Reformation, Seſſ.* 24. was quite deſtroyed, by the exception there added, —— *Ab his excipiantur cauſa,* —— *quas ex urgenti rationabilique cauſa, judicaverit ſummus Romanus Pontifex, per ſpeciale Reſcriptum Signaturæ ſanctitatis ſuæ manu propria ſubſcribendum, committere, aut avocare:* He anſwers thus, —— *That, though the* Pope *may ſtill call to himſelf, what cauſes he thinks fit, ſo he paſſeth this firſt, under his own Hand, and Seal; yet, that the former faculty of his Officers to call ſuch cauſes to him, though in his name, yet without his knowledge, or ſubſcription, was now ceaſed by this new Order;* —— And, That, if it be numbred (as that is eaſily counted which is ſeldom done), How many Commiſſions, of this kind, are ſigned by the *Pope* in a year for the whole Circuit of Chriſtianity, if theſe riſe to three or four yearly, it is acknowledged very much. Thus he, of the former Income to the Court of *Rome* much diminiſhed: and, of the Acts of this Council, after the decurrence of an hundred years, as to this matter, ſtill retaining their primitive vigour; publiſhing theſe things in that place, where, in matters ſo obvious, and evident, his credit muſt ſuffer very much by any falſification. But, on the other ſide, the Epiſcopal Authority, in this Council, was ſo much increaſed by the *Pope*'s, and the *Council*'s committing many both perſons, and affairs, before exempt, and reſerved, to their Inſpection, and Government, (as which Biſhops, being at a nearer diſtance, could better diſcern and attend them) that the King of *Spain* ſaid of his —— *That they went to the Council as ſo many Pariſh Prieſts; but returned from it, ſo many* Popes.

Next; the Decrees themſelves concerning *Reformation* (which in a few hours you may read deliberately over; and where eſpecially I would recommend to you the view of thoſe made under *Pius*; and, amongſt theſe, thoſe chiefly of the 24*th Seſſion.*) I ſay, the Decrees themſelves do ſhew the great ſervice, which this Council hath done to the Church, at that time much relaxed, and languiſhing in its *Diſcipline*, partly by reaſon of it's non-execution of former neceſſary Church-Canons, partly by other abuſes, not provided againſt by any former laws, and now growing intolerable. In all which matters a much better face of Eccleſiaſtical affairs appears at preſent, through the Influence, which this Council hath had upon the ſucceeding times. And much have thoſe ungrateful Detractors to anſwer to God, by whom the *Good* of this great Body of the moſt ſacred of Magiſtrates hath been, not only ſo little acknowledged, but ſo *evil-ſpoken of.* §. 206.

It

§. 207. It would be too tedious to recite to you all the particular Acts of this Council, wherein it hath repaired the former decayes: but perhaps not unneceſſary, in ſuch an ungrateful age, to relate, and clear ſome of the chiefeſt.

The manners, and cuſtoms of the Church, that chiefly in thoſe times were imagined to give cauſe of juſt Complaint, ſeem to be,

α. 1. Concerning the *Pope*, and *Court of* Rome. 1. α. The Avocation of ſo many *Cauſes*, and admiſſion of ſo many *Appeals* (without aſcent, as formerly, through inferiour Courts; eſpecially thoſe of *Dioceſan*, and *Provincial* Synods).

β. β. And the reſervation of ſo many Licenſes, and *Diſpenſations*, to the *Apoſtolick See*, and Court of *Rome*; Theſe not to be proſecuted, or procured, without great charge; Nor the Judge, at ſo great a diſtance, capable of ſo true, and exact informations, either touching the Perſon, or Cauſe.

γ. 2. γ. The Pope's *Collation* of *Biſhopricks*, and other *ſpiritual Benefices* in foreign States, where the Merits of ſuch perſons, as are moſt fit,

δ. and capable of them, are little known to him. 3. δ. The impoſing of

ε. ζ. *Penſions* on ſuch ſpiritual Benefices. ε. Or giving them in *Commendam*; ζ. Or *uniting many* of them into one without any neceſſity; So to furniſh Favou-

η. rites with a ſuperfluous wealth; and hidden Pluralities. 4. η. The *Exemptions* of ſo many perſons, and Societies, from Epiſcopal Juriſdictions, which Biſhops, by their vicinity of Reſidence, are the fitteſt Rectifiers of all

θ. diſorders. 5. θ. Several abuſes committed by the Perſons publiſhing *Indulgences*, and collecting the *Charities* of Chriſtians for pious uſes.

§. 208. [I name not here, amongſt theſe Grievances, the *Pope*'s *Annats* (in lieu of the Tenths of Tithes) or other conſtant ſupports, received from the inferiour Clergy out of the ſeveral States of the *Weſtern* Church, becauſe it neither ſeemed juſt to the Council to deprive him of them; nor, to the Secular Princes, in their many *Articles* of *Reformation* propoſed, to requeſt it. (See thoſe of the *Emperor*, *Soave*, p. 513. of the King of *France*, p. 652.) as they well ſeeing, that it was neceſſary for this General *Father* of the Church, both to have, wherewith to maintain ſo many Officers in his Service, whether at home, or abroad, as the Church-affairs, paſſing through his hands, required; and, wherewith alſo to reward their pains. And, if the ancient Biſhops of *Rome* managed theſe great affairs with a much ſmaller Revenue; yet it muſt be granted; 1. Both that much leſs was then neceſſary, by reaſon as well of the much narrower extent of *Chriſtendom*; as alſo of the union of moſt of it, in thoſe times, under one Secular Power, the *Emperor*; whereas now the preſervation of the unity of Catholick Faith, and neceſſary correſpondence between the Members of this Church ſo much more diffuſed, and reſiding in ſo many States of a contrary temper, gives much more trouble and charge to the Supream Head thereof. And, 2*ly*, Muſt be granted alſo; That, by the want, then, of the preſent ſubſiſtence, whilſt the *Pope* was the *Emperor*'s temporal Subject, both many inconveniences, and injuries were ſuffered, and many Benefactions hindered.] This of the Complaints concerning the *Pope* and his *Court*.

2. Con-

2. Concerning the *Clergy*. 1. *κ. Unfit* perſons elected into *Biſhopricks*, and other Eccleſiaſtical *Benefices*, without a ſufficient pre-examination of their learning and manners. 2. *λ. Pluralities* of *Benefices*; where theſe, ſingly, afford a maintenance ſufficient, whilſt other worthy perſons are deſtitute; and the miſ-expence of ſuch ample Church-Revenues on their Secular Relations. 3. *μ. Non-Reſidence*, where having the care, or charge, of ſouls. 4. *ν.* In their Reſidence, *Neglect* of frequent *Preaching*, and Catechiſing. And, Their not celebrating, at leaſt, part of the Divine Service, nor teaching the ignorant the Myſteries of Religion, in the *vulgar tongue*. 5. *ξ.* Their being reſtrained from *Marriage*; and, in *Celibacy*, their frequent Incontinency, and violation of Chaſtity. 6. *π.* Their with-holding the *Communion* of the *Cup* both from the Laity, and themſelves, when not officiating. 7. *ϱ.* Their too common uſe of *Excommunication*; applying many times the ſevereſt of the Church's Cenſures to the ſmalleſt Delinquencies. 8. *σ.* To which may be added, the many diſorders, then obſerved, in *Regulars* and *Monaſticks*. 9. *τ.* The correction neceſſary of ſeveral things in the *Miſſals*, and *Breviaries*; and bringing them to a greater Uniformity. §. 209. *κ.* *λ.* *μ.* *ν.* *ξ.* *π.* *ϱ.* *σ.* *τ.*

Conſidering theſe, and ſeveral other grievances, ſee the Articles of *Reformation* propoſed by the *Emperor*'s Agents, before the 21*ſt* and 24*th* Seſſions, in *Soave*, p. 513, and 751. and by the *French*, before the 23*d Seſſion*, in *Soave*, 652. Theſe therefore the Council took into due conſideration; and rectified what they judged amiſs, * ſo far, as that Iron-age would permit: (of which the Council thus complains, *Seſſ.* 25. *De Reform. Regul. c.* 21. *Adeo dura, difficiliſque eſt præſentium temporum conditio, ut nec ſtatim omnibus, nec commune, ubique quod optaret, remedium poſſet adhiberi:*) and * ſo far, as the National parties in the Council, inured to ſeveral cuſtoms, and enjoying different privileges, without the making of a Schiſm, could agree upon: rectified, I ſay, ſo far, as their Ordinations, ſtrengthned with ſevere penalties, could do it: But the conſtant execution of theſe depends on others, whoſe diligence, or ſupineneſs herein muſt needs produce, in the Church, contrary effects; and alſo the neceſſity of leaving their *Canons*, upon juſt occaſions, (all which no law can fit,) *diſpenſable*, muſt alſo leave open a paſſage to ſuch Governours, as are corrupt, or negligent, of ſuch diſpenſations without a reaſonable cauſe. §. 210.

1*ſt*. Then, for thoſe matters that concern the *Pope*, and *Court* of *Rome*: See the many Decrees in this Council, wherein the Biſhops are ſubſtituted, as perpetual and ſtanding *Delegates* of the *Apoſtolick See* for the *Execution* of them, and the former Reſervations remitted; though this to the great diminution of the Revenue of the *Pope*, and his Officers, as hath been ſaid. † Such Decrees are, *Seſſ.* 5. *c.* 1, 2. *De Reform.*——*Seſſ.* 6. *c.* 4.——*Seſſ.* 7. *c.* 6.——*Seſſ.* 13. *c.* 5.——*Seſſ.* 21. *c.* 5, 8.——*Seſſ.* 22. *c.* 5, 8.——*Seſſ.* 24. *c.* 11. And very many others. In which matter, though the Biſhops are empowred, as *Delegates* of the *See Apoſtolick*, becauſe the point, whether Biſhops hold their Juriſdictions, as to the exterior, and forenſick, exerciſe thereof, in, and over, ſuch particular things, and perſons *immediately* from Chriſt, or from the *Pope*, was indeed much agitated in the Council, but §. 211. † §. 205.

but on no ſide determined. Yet ſo it is, that a poſſeſſion they have now of ſeveral branches of ſuch Juriſdiction, ſince this Council, which they had not before. Nor varies it any thing in the good ſervice actually done, thereby, to the Church, by what way ſoever this power deſcends upon them.

§. 212. To come cloſer then to the Particulars. For, *a. Cauſes*; and *Appeals*: See the reſtraint made therein, *Seſſ.* 13. *c.* 1. *Seſſ.* 22. *c.* 1. —— *Nec appellatio executionem hanc, quæ ad morum correctionem pertinet, ſuſpendat.* And, Seſſ. 24. c. 10.—— *Nec in his, ubi de viſitatione, aut morum correctione agitur, exemptio, aut ulla inhibitio, appellatio, ſeu querela, etiam ad ſedem Apoſtolicam interpoſita, executionem eorum, quæ ab his mandata, decreta, aut judicata fuerint, quoquo modo impediat, aut ſuſpendat.* Again, *Seſſ.* 21. *c.* 8.——*Seſſ.* 25. *c.* 10. The *Pope*, and *Council*, delegate ſuch perſons, as ſhall be choſen in the *Provincial*, or *Dioceſan*, Synod, together with the *Ordinary* (to be ſupplied, if any one of them dies before the next Synod, by the *Biſhop*, and *Chapter*) to decide theſe Appeals in the *Province*, or Dioceſs, where ſuch Controverſies ariſe; unleſs they be ſuch, as for the weight of them are thought fit to be removed to *Rome*. *Seſſ.* 24. 5. It is ordered, that the criminal cauſes of Biſhops, except thoſe more heinous ones of Hereſie, or the like, where their ejectment is queſtioned, which are reſerved to the *Apoſtolick See*, are to be terminated either by a *Provincial* Council; or, in the interval, by its Deputies. And, *Ib. c.* 20. Civil, Matrimonial, Criminal Cauſes are left to be ended by inferior Tribunals (without the intermedling of the *Pope*'s Legates, or Nuncios, herein); except thoſe; *Quas, ex urgenti, rationabilique cauſa, judicaverit ſummus Romanus Pontifex, per ſpeciale Reſcriptum ſignaturæ ſanctitatis ſuæ, manu propria ſubſcribendum, committere, aut avocare.* Where, *ex urgenti, rationabilique cauſa, reſcriptum ſignaturæ ſanctitatis ſuæ manu propria ſubſcribendum*, a Reſcript, after the matter is particularly made known to the *Pope*, and, upon this, his Hand, and Seal obtained, cannot be a thing ſo ordinarily happening, as to overthrow the whole benefit of the Decree, as *Soave* would perſwade †.

To *a.*

† *p.* 792.

§. 213. Next: Concerning the forementioned *Provincial*, and *Dioceſan* Synods, which were to elect the perſons for deciding ſuch Appeals, [which Synods the Council judged very neceſſary, ——*Moderandis moribus, corrigendis exceſſibus, controverſiis componendis*, &c. and to which it committed a chief ſuperintendence over the actions of Biſhops, as to their due execution of its Decrees touching *Reformation.*] It is ordered, *Seſſ.* 24. *c.* 2. That the *Provincial* Synods be called by the *Metropolitan*; or, he juſtly hindred, by the Senior *Biſhop* of the *Province*, at leaſt once every three years, after the *Octave* of *Eaſter*, or other time, if more Convenient; and a *Dioceſan*, once every year; In the calling of, and meeting in, which, if any neglected their Duty, they incur the Eccleſiaſtical Cenſures, preſcribed by former Canons. And thoſe Biſhops, who are Subject to no Archbiſhop, are obliged to chuſe ſome *Province*, of whoſe Synods they ſhall for the future be members, and be ſubjected to its Decrees. Ordered alſo, that in theſe Synods (not having a conſtant being) certain Deputies be choſen, which may, in the Intervals, deter-

determine ſuch Cauſes, and execute ſuch Orders, as this *Council* hath committed to them. But mean-while, as for other cauſes, not thought meet to be entruſted to Delegates, nor that conveniently can be ſo long ſuſpended, as till another *Provincial* Synod ſits, (which for the great trouble, and charge of their meeting, later *Councils*, upon the experience of former *Canons* neglected, appointed to be held ſeldomer, nor yet is this obeyed) it ſeemed neceſſary, that without expecting theſe, ſuch cauſes ſhould, from the *Pope*, a higher ſtanding Judge, receive a preſent diſpatch (of which ſee what is ſaid before, §. 16. *n.* 6. and *n.* 8.) And, —— *The* reſtoring *of* Synodal Judicatures [*i. e.* as to all cauſes] (ſaith *Soave* †) *was rejected by almoſt all the Fathers of the Council*; For which he gives a reaſon, after his uſual manner, the moſt uncharitable one, he could invent, —— *That they did this, becauſe ſuch* Synodal *Judicatures did diminiſh the* Epiſcopal, *and were too popular.* The *Epiſcopal* he means taken ſingly in their diſtinct Courts; elſe the Synodal is nothing elſe but a conjunct Judicature of Biſhops. But perhaps ſome of thoſe reaſons given by *Caſtellus*, for this, (*apud Soave*, p. 335.) may ſeem more perſwaſive; *viz. Beſide their being no ſtanding Court, and rarely convened, the difficulty that was found, to inform ſo many; and the impediments in the examination, where many are to do it; the infinite length in the proceedings and diſpatches; the parties and diviſions therein, that are uſually made by the factions*; for which *Caſtellus* imagines, that Synods came to be, in later times, more intermitted; and other Courts, and Officers brought in, to remedy ſuch diſorders. † p. 336.

§. 214.

Mean-while; Of Appeals of higher conſequence received, and judged, by moſt holy *Popes*, Antiquity affords many examples. See more mentioned before, §. 13. *n.* 1. And, indeed, ſuch a ſuperlative power, as to *cauſes of greater moment*, ſeems very neceſſary. For, 1*ſt.* This *Prime Patriarch*, and ſupreme Governor in the Church, being conſtituted by a more *choice* Election, is preſumed ordinarily to be a more *knowing* perſon, and according to the eminency of his place, aſſiſted both with a *wiſer* Council, and a greater portion of *God's Spirit*. But, 2*ly.* though he were neither more prudent, nor better informed from others in difficult matters, nor more aſſiſted from Heaven, yet muſt he, needs, be a *leſs partial* Judge in ſuch matters, becauſe not ſo intereſſed in the *cauſe*, or in the *perſons*, as the *Metropolitan* often muſt be, or alſo thoſe other Biſhops, who live upon the place, and are ſubject to the *Metropolitan's* power: Now, the more remote from all private intereſt, and high in place, the Judge is, the more even he is likely to hold the Scales of Juſtice; and to adminiſter it, leſs ſwayed with affection, or maſtered by fear. 3*ly.* The chief Courts, to whom, beſide the *Roman* Biſhop, the termination of Appeals of moment is recommended, being *Provincial*, *National*, or *General*, Councils, were their Judgements never ſo ſatisfactory to all parties, (though *Provincial*, or *National* Synods have not been always thought ſo, witneſs thoſe *African* ones in the cauſe of *Cecilianus*), yet are not theſe always to be had: The *Provincial* Synods much ſeldomer aſſembled, than the Canons appoint; Councils *General* yet more rare; none of of them, by reaſon of the trouble of convening, ſit, upon every ſuch Ap-

peal, to be called. 4*ly.* Many cases of Appeals are not matters of Fact, where witnesses are necessary; but questions, *de jure*, where the fact is confessed; and, in such, no more plea can be made to have them tried at home, than the *Mosaical* Legalists of *Antioch* could justly have demanded, not to have this matter decided at *Jerusalem*; or *Arius* of *Alexandria*, his, at *Nice*. As for the conveniency of hearing Witnesses, where 'tis necessary in such Appeals, it was ordered indeed anciently; that, whensoever it could safely be done, such causes should be arbitrated in the same, or some adjoyning *Provinces*, by some Judges, either sent thither, or, there, delegated by the *Patriarch*, (of which the Seventh *Canon* of *Sardica* seems to take special care;) or at least, that Commissioners might be sent to examine witnesses at home; in the non-observance of which *Canons* perhaps some *Roman* Bishops may have been culpable, and caused some affliction to the Church's Subjects: But yet other exigences may occur (every cause not being fit to be decided by Delegates) that require the trial to be before the *Pope*'s own person, to which greater necessities the trouble caused to witnesses must give place; which trials at *Rome* are also allowed by the Council of *Sardica*, *c.* 4. And we have no reason to think, but that this grave Assembly at *Sardica* weighed the troubles of such Appeals, as well as the *Africans* did afterward; or we now: but thought fit to admit smaller inconveniences to avoid greater mischiefs, namely, in the Intervals of Councils, Schisms, and Divisions between *Provincial*, and between *National*, Churches, by the Church her having thus so many Supremes, terminating all spiritual causes within themselves, as there were Provinces, or Countries, Christian. 5*ly.* If this Avocation to the Supreme be now done without the Method, somtimes used, of ascending by degrees through many subordinate Courts, this, when such Courts have not a cogent Power for terminating the Cause, seems only a shortning both of the trouble, and charge.

§. 215. To β *Dispensations.* See, *Sess.* 25. *c.* 18. where, in General, Provision is made by the Council, That, —— *Si urgens justaque ratio, & major quandoque*

To β. *utilitas, postulaverint cum aliquibus dispensandum esse; id, causa cognita, ac summa maturitate, atque gratis, a quibuscunque ad quos dispensatio pertinebit, erit præstandum; aliterque facta dispensatio surreptitia censeatur.* This Dispensation, then, by whomsoever given, is to be made *gratis*; otherwise, to be held surreptitious; and the cognition of this surreption is referred to the Ordinary, *Sess.* 22. *c.* 5. Again ordered, *Sess.* 22. *c.* 5. *That no* Dispensations of Grace, *obtained at* Rome, *shall take effect, except first examined by the Bishop of the place, whether obtained justly, and upon a right information.* Again, *Sess.* 24. *c.* 6. *Bishops are impowred to dispense with their Subjects,* in foro conscientiæ, *in all Irregularities, and Suspensions, for secret offences, except voluntary murther,* &c. *and to absolve in all cases occult, that are reserved to the* See Apostolick. Of which, and other the like, relaxations in this Council, of their former restraints, what the issue hath been

† §. 205. in the Court of *Rome*, see what is quoted before † out of *Pallavicino*, *Introduction.* c. 10.

§. 216. Mean-while, as the same Council hath observed, *Sess.* 25. *c.* 18. it seems necessary; 1. That Laws be not so enacted, as to leave in the hands of no

perſon a power of *Diſpenſations*. 2. And again neceſſary; That this power of Diſpenſing be not, as to matters more important, left always in the hands of Inferior Magiſtrates; eſpecially thoſe living upon the place; and therefore more liable to be ſwayed by friendſhips, importunity, fear, and overawing; this laſt, requiſite, that the obligation of laws, by the facility of diſpenſing, be not quite diſſolved; the firſt; that the Law, too rigidly exacted, may not ſomtimes oppreſs; and what *Civil* Government is there, that by its retaining a *Diſpenſative Power*, as to their Temporal Laws, in the hands of the Supreme Magiſtrate, doth not amply juſtifie the Eccleſiaſtick, herein?

§. 217.

Such a *Diſpenſative Power*, therefore, from ancient times, hath been thought fit to be depoſited in the chief Biſhop of the Chriſtian Univerſe, and from him ſuch Diſpenſations, and Relaxations to be received, as neceſſity requires. Such was that, conceded by St. *Gregory*, *l.* 12. *Ep.* 31. to the *Engliſh*, upon the hazzard of their deſerting the new-founded *Chriſtianity*, concerning Marriages, for a time in ſome degrees prohibited by the *Canons* of the Church, and that, to the *Sicilian* Biſhops (who could not be brought to do more) concerning holding a *Provincial* Council once a year, when the *Canons* required twice: Before him, ſuch that conceded by *Gelatius*, in *Ep.* 9. to the Biſhops in *Italy* (complaining to him, that many of their Churches, by the *Gothick* wars, were rendred deſtitute of a Clergy) in which he relaxed ſeveral things required by the former *Canons* to Ordinations, *&c.* after he had made this Preface, —— *Neceſſaria rerum diſpenſatione conſtringimur, ſic Canonum paternorum decreta librare, & retro Præſulum, deceſſorumque noſtrorum præcepta metiri: ut quæ præſentium neceſſitas temporum, reſtaurandis Eccleſiis, relaxanda depoſcit, quantum poteſt fieri, temperemus.* —— *Igitur, tam inſtituendi quam promovendi clericalis obſequii ſic ſpatia diſpenſanda concedimus*, &c. Before him, by *Simplician*, *Ep.* 14. to the Emperor *Zeno*, in which he allowed the election of the Biſhop of *Antioch* made, for preventing a ſedition, at *Conſtantinople*, contrary to the Fourth *Nicen* Canon. And, before him by *Celeſtine*, † allowing, by his Letters ſent to the Biſhop of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, the Election of *Proclus*, who was before the deſigned Biſhop of *Cyzicum*, to be Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, procured by the Emperor † *Theodoſius* for preventing ſome tumults; where the *Pope* either diſpenſed with, or more indulgently expounded, ſome former *Church-Canons* that ſeemed, to have prohibited all *Tranſlation* of *Biſhops*.

† *Socrat. Hiſt. l.* 7. *c.* 39, 40.

† See *Conc. Antioch. c.* 21.

To γ. See the anſwer to ϰ.

§. 218.

To δ. *Penſions*, reſerved by the *Pope* out of ſome richer Eccleſiaſtical *Benefices*, as rewards of perſons much meriting in the Church's ſervice; † ſeemed hard, ſuppoſe it could have been juſtly done, to deprive the *Pope* of them, whilſt Secular Princes would ſtill retain them; and were much diſpleaſed, when, in the Articles provided for *Reformation of Princes*, † ſuch things were demanded of themſelves, as they would have redreſſed in others; yet the Council thus far moderated this matter; That thoſe Biſhopricks, or Benefices, of a ſmaller revenue, not amounting to above ſuch a certain ſumm yearly, ſhould not be, for the future, charged with any ſuch Penſions, *Seſſ.* 24. *c.* 13.

To γ.

To δ.

† Mentiond in *Soave*, *p.* 769.

And for the reſt, ſince all Penſions could not be voided, (which perhaps had been beſt;) yet may it ſeem as equitable, That the Eccleſiaſtick Governours do continue to make uſe of them for recompenſing perſons of extraordinary merit in the Church, as Princes, thoſe in the State; Eſpecially when the Council hath provided; that they be taken from no Church, but where ſuch an overplus may be ſpared; and that Revenue only applied to maintain two, which indeed is ſuperfluous for one.

§. 219. To ε. The like, much-what, may be ſaid, of *Monaſteries*; or other Eccleſiaſtical *Benefices* with, or without, cure, given in *Commendam*, a ſuper-

To ε. intendence over which the Council hath committed for ever, either to the *Superiors* of ſuch *Orders*; or to the *Biſhops*, as the *Pope*'s Delegates; to take care, that in the one all religious obſervance be maintained, with all neceſſaries ſupplied; and in the other, the care of ſouls faithfully diſcharged, and the *Vicar* ſufficiently provided for; See *Seſſ.* 21. *c.* 8. —— And, *Seſſ.* 25. *c.* 20. *Reform. Regul.* And further, *c.* 21. That for *Monaſteries Commendatory*, they, for the future, ſhall be conferred only on *Regulars*. A Conſtitution, which in *France*, where very many *Monaſteries* are given by the Prince in *Commendams* to great Perſonages, hath been one of the chief Obſtacles of that Prince's refuſing to accept this Council, as to its Acts of *Reformation*.

§. 220. To ζ. The *uniting* of *Eccleſiaſtical Benefices*: As the Council doth allow ſuch

To ζ. an *union* to be made by the Biſhops, as Delegates of the *Apoſtolick See*, where one ſingle is not a ſufficient maintenance of the Paſtor, *Seſſ.* 21. *c.* 5. —— *Seſſ.* 24. *c.* 15. And allows the ſame to be done in *Biſhopricks* by the *Pope*, upon Teſtimonials received from a *Provincial* Synod of ſuch a neceſſity, *Seſſ.* 24. *c.* 13. So, on the other ſide, *Seſſ.* 7. *c.* 6. It empowers *Biſhops* for ever, as the *Pope*'s Delegates, to inquire into all former unitings of Livings paſſed within forty years, and to void them, *Niſi eas ex legitimis, aut alias rationabilibus cauſſis, coram loci Ordinario vocatis, quorum intereſt, verificandis, factas fuiſſe conſtiterit.* And *c.* 5, and 7. Conſtitutes the *Biſhops* likewiſe *Viſitors* of all thoſe having cure, that are annexed to *Chapters*, or *Monaſteries*, that the incumbent *Vicars* do their duty, and be provided of a ſufficient Revenue, all manner of privileges, or exemptions, being repealed. See more below (λ).

§. 221. To ν. *Exemptions.* This Council hath ordered, 1ſt. That all *Churches*

To ν. whatever, though formerly exempted, thoſe alſo that are annexed to *Colledges*, or *Monaſteries*, be ſubjected to the yearly viſitation of the *Ordinary*, as *Delegate* of the *See Apoſtolick*; to ſee to, that the *Cura animarum* be rightly diſcharged; all things kept in a due repair, *&c. Seſſ.* 7, 8. 2ly. *Seſſ.* 22. *c.* 8. *Biſhops* as *Delegates* of the *Apoſtolick See*, are made *Executors* of all pious Diſpoſures, as well Teſtamentary, as of the Living; *Hoſpitals* alſo, and whatever *Colledges*, Confraternities of *Laicks*, *Schools*, the *Almes* of the *Mounts of Piety*, &c. whatever *Exemptions* they might have had formerly, are ſubjected to their Viſitation (where it is not otherwiſe ordered by the Founders,) to take knowledge of, and ſee executed therein, whatever is inſtituted for God's worſhip, ſalvation of ſouls, or ſuſtentation of the poor, and the *Adminiſtrators* thereof tyed to give to them a yearly account (*c.* 9.)

3. Again;

3. Again; All Secular Clergy, that had formerly any *exemption*, and all *Cathedral Chapters* (formerly exempted under the notion of *Regulars*, which many of them anciently were) are likewiſe ſubmitted, for the future, to the viſitation, and correction of the *Biſhop* —— *Seſſ.* 6. 4. —— *Seſſ.* 14. *c.* 4. —— *Seſſ.* 25. 6. 4. As for *Regulars*; All ſuch, living out of their *Monaſteries*, and other perſons whatever relating to them, or otherwiſe privileged, may be viſited, corrected, puniſhed by the Biſhop, as are others, *Seſſ.* 6. 3. —— *Seſſ.* 29. 11. Nor may any *Regulars* preach in any Church, not belonging to their Order, without the *Biſhop*'s licenſe firſt obtained; Nor in Churches of the *Order*, without firſt ſhewing to the Biſhop a Licenſe from their Superiours, and receiving his Benediction. 5. Laſtly, for the *Monaſteries*, and *Religious* Houſes themſelves exempted from the Epiſcopal Viſitation, it is ordered; that, if the *Regular* Superiours, to whom this is committed, omit their duty, the *Biſhop*, after a Paternal admonition, and their ſix months further neglect, may proceed to viſit, and reform them; Notwithſtanding whatever Exemptions, or Conſervators appointed of their Privileges. *Seſſ.* 21. 8.

§. 222. But an univerſal ſubjection of *Monaſteries*, *Univerſities*, *Colledges*, to the *Ordinary* of the place, though mentioned in the Council, was not approved by it. Not that ſuch whoſe publick profeſſion was a ſtricter life than that of all others, ſhould enjoy more liberty from Government; or, at leaſt, from that of ſubordinate, and immediate Superintendents; But, becauſe it ſeemed much more proper, that as their Profeſſion was more ſevere, ſo they ſhould be committed rather to the care of ſuch Superiours, who themſelves had the ſame obligations; which it was feared, that the *Ordinary*, living himſelf after a Secular way, would be more prone to mitigate, and relax; or ſome way, by contradicting their Orders, diſturb their Peace. And therefore ſuch exemption tended not to an enlargement of their liberty, but a confirming their reſtraints, and a quiet and undiſturbed obſervance thereof. And ſuch Exemptions and Privileges we find anciently granted to *Religious* Houſes by *Popes* famous in Sanctity. Of which ſee many in St. *Gregory*'s Epiſtles, not only conceded by himſelf, but mentioned to have been ſo by his Predeceſſors. See, *l.* 7. *ep.* 33. and *ep.* 18. And ſee —— *l.* 11. *ep.* 8. ſuch Privileges granted, at the requeſt of the Queen of *France*. Yet ſtill, as was ſaid but now, the Epiſcopal power is admitted by the Council of *Trent* in theſe Houſes alſo, upon any continued neglect of their other Superiours, when firſt admoniſhed hereof.

§. 223. To 8. *Abuſes* concerning *Indulgences*, and *Collecting* the *Charities* of Chriſtians for pious uſes: It was ordered, *Seſſ.* 21. *c.* 9. That the Office of the ordinary former Publiſhers of ſuch *Indulgences*, and Spiritual Favours, and the Collectors of ſuch Charities (having given ſo much Scandal, after the endeavour of three ſeveral precedent Councils to reform them) and all their privileges ſhould be taken quite away; and hence-forward, that the *Ordinary* of the place, aſſiſted with two of the *Chapter*, ſhould publiſh the one, and collect the other, *Gratis*.

To 8.

Thus

§. 224. Thus much of this Council's rectifying those things, which seemed to minister any just cause of Complaint concerning the *Pope*, or his Court; where also you see, how much the Episcopal Authority is enlarged by the *Pope*'s free Concession to them of so many former *Reservations*, and *Exemptions*. So that *Lainez* the *General* of the *Jesuites* in his speech before the 24th Session † See *Palla.* *l.* 23. *c.* 3. *n.* 30. † observes, —— *That the hand of the Council had fallen heavy upon others, without touching at all the Bishops; that there was contained in those Articles of* Reformation *much against the* Pope, *against the* Cardinals, *against* Arch-Deacons, *against the* Chapters, *against* Parish Priests, *against the* Regulars; *but against the* Bishops *nothing*. And *Soave* ‖ *P.* 343. on *Sess.* 13. produceth the *Priests* of *Germany* complaining of the Reformation; and saying, —— *That the Bishops Authority was made too great, and the Clergy brought into servitude.* And † *P.* 568. on the 22d *Session*, saith, —— *That points of Reformation were proposed favourable to the Authority of Bishops, that the Legats proceeding might not be hindered by the opposition of any.* From all which you may further gather, what truths his † *P.* 2. words have, set in the entrance of his History: † —— *That the* Bishops, *hoping to regain the Episcopal Authority, usurped, for the most part, by the* Pope, *now wholly lost it; and the* Pope, *fearing a Moderation of his former exorbitant power, had it now, much more than ever, established, and confirmed.*

§. 225. Next to proceed to the Grievances concerning the Clergy. To *x*. The Complaint concerning *unfit*, and *unworthy* persons elected both into *Bishopricks*, To *x*. and inferior *Benefices* of Cure.

1st. For the future Election of *Bishops*, this Council ordered, *Sess.* 24. *c.* 1. That there should be drawn up by the *Provincial* Synods a certain Form, for taking Informations, and examining the Persons nominated to such Ecclesiastical Dignities, to be approved by the *Pope*: Then, concerning the particular Person to be elected; an Instrument of the Examination, made according to the Form prescribed, is to be sent to his *Holiness*: And this Instrument there first to be perused by four *Cardinals*; who, if they also approve, are to subscribe it, and to affirm —— *Se certo* (to give you the words of the Canon) *existimare, sub periculo mortis æternæ, idoneos esse, qui Ecclesiis præficiantur*; the relation also of these *Cardinals* is to be made in one *Consistory*; but the deliberation deferred to another, that things may be more exactly weighed. The person also to be chosen is particularly to have the Testimonial of his *Ordinary*, or of the *Pope*'s *Nuncio*, residing in such place, *Sess.* 22. *c.* 2. And what course is observed in *Bishops*, the same ordered to be in the Election of *Cardinals*, *Sess.* 24. *c.* 1. Lastly, the Council admonisheth in General * all those, who have the right of any such Collation. —— *Eos mortaliter peccare, nisi eos præfici curaverint, quos* [not *dignos*, but] *digniores & Ecclesiis magis utiles, ipsi judicaverint*; and particularly, * the *Pope*, that, if he be faulty herein, either as to the Promotion of Cardinals, or Bishops, unfit, —— *Ovium Christi sanguinem, quæ ex malo negligentium, & sui Officii immemorum Pastorum regimine peribunt, Dominus Noster Jesus Christus de manibus ejus sit requisiturus.*

§. 226. This for the Election of *Bishops*. Next, For the Election of worthy Persons into inferior *Church-Benefices* with Cure. 1st. It is ordered, *Sess.* 24. *c.* 18.

*c.*18. That, whoever the Patron be, there be six * Examiners nominated by the *Diocesan* Synod; all which, or at least three of them, together with the Bishop are, at a time prefixt, publickly to try the sufficiency of such as are presented; and only such a person as is approved by them, or, if many be presented, who is thought the more worthy is to be admitted to such Benefice; without which Examination, and Approvement, the Collation of such Benefice to be accounted Surreptitious; and another Election to be made. The Bishop being permitted thus to choose the Person, even where the *Pope* gives Institution. —— *Ita Sanctissimus voluit* (saith the Congregation of *Cardinals* appointed for the Interpreters of the Decrees of the Council, †) *quia Episcopus melius cognoscit personas.* *Pius* the Fourth † having also, before this *Session*, concerning Benefices in his Disposal, made this free offer to the Fathers of the *Council*. 1. Either, that henceforth all Benefices having *Curam Animarum*, should be in their Gift, and the other *without Cure* in his. 2. Or, that henceforth he would bestow them on none, who shall not also be, by the *Ordinary* approved *worthy*. 3. Or, that he would only make his Election out of such Persons, *worthy*, and of the *Dioceses*, of whom the Bishop should send him a Roll: After which, the Council agreed upon the Constitution forementioned: Which not escaping *Soave*'s Censure, who saith, —— *That it was framed with exquisite artifice, and with a fair shew makes the* Bishops *Patrons to give the Cure to whom they please, upon pretence of Examinations: But yet taketh no profit from the Court of* Rome: [The Institution still being reserved to the *Pope*, and a *Bull* to be had from thence.] *Pallavicino* † returns this answer, —— *That any reasonable man may well observe what a loss here of his own benefit the* Pope *consented to, for the benefit of the Church, when he was pleased to take from himself the bestowing, according to his own choice,* [by this being now left to the Bishop, and the Examiners] *of so many* Benefices, *as should happen to be vacant, for eight months in the year, in so many Kingdoms of* Christendom; *and when he deprived his Court of that frequent Concourse formerly made to it, of so many foreign* Ecclesiasticks, *who, otherwise, must first have made themselves known there, for the obtaining these Benefices at home.*

† In 24. *Sess. c.* 18. *fig.* 33.

† *Pallavic. l.* 22. *c.* 1. *n.* 18. quoting *Card. Borrom.* letter to the Legates.

† 23. *c.* 3, 12.

2. Again, to remove all temptations, arising from *gain*, to introduce persons into the Clergy of less worth: It is ordered, *Sess.* 21. *c.* 1. that all things be passed *Gratis*; save that the under Officers, such as have no set stipend, may receive some small fee, not to exceed the tenth part of a *Crown* for their labours, provided the Collator share nothing in it. —— *Nihil* (saith the Council) *pro collatione quorumcunque Ordinum, etiam Clericalis Tonsurae, nec pro litteris dimissoriis aut testimonialibus, nec pro sigillo, nec alia quacunque de causa, etiam sponte oblatum, Episcopi & alii ordinum Collatores, aut eorum Ministri, quovis praetextu, accipiant. Notarii vero, in iis tantum locis, in quibus non viget laudabilis consuetudo nihil accipiendi, pro singulis litteris dimissoriis, aut Testimonialibus decimam tantum unius aurei partem accipere possint; dummodo eis nullum Salarium sit constitutum pro officio exercendo: nec Episcopo ex Notarii commodis aliquod Emolumentum, ex eisdem Ordinum Collationibus directe, vel indirecte, provenire possit; tunc enim gratis operam suam eos praestare omnino teneri decernit:* And —— *Qui secus fecerint, tam dantes quam accipientes, ultra divinam ultionem, panas*

§. 227.

panas a jure inflictas ipso facto incurrant: which Decree is understood also of the *Collation* of *Benefices*, and of *Dispensations*. See the Exposition of the Congregation of *Cardinals* on this Decree, §. *Item Declarat.*

§. 228. 3ly To see also the Parochial duties rightly discharged by the Clergy: It is ordered, *Sess.* 24. 3. That the *Bishop* by himself, or his *Vicar*, visit yearly his *Dioceſs*; or, if large, the greater part of it; and the Remainder in the year following; and that the *Provincial* Councils punish any *Bishop's* neglects herein.

§. 229. 4ly Ordered also, *Sess.* 29. *c.* 4. That the *Bishop*, as *Apostolical* Delegate, where the People of a Parish are very numerous, may either erect a new Parish, dividing the Profits; or compel the *Rector* of such Parish, when not able alone to perform the Pastoral Duty to so great a multitude, to admit, and maintain so many other *Priests*, assistant, as may be sufficient; and also, where the *Bishop* finds an illiterate *Rector*, who is otherwise of a good life, may add a Coadjutor, partaker of the Profits. See *Sess.* 21. *c.* 6.

§. 230. 5ly Ordered also, *Sess.* 23. *c.* 18. —— That, for the better supply of the Ecclesiastical Ministry, in all *Cathedral* Churches, be erected a *Seminary*, for the educating a certain number of Children of poor people (or also of rich, if maintained by themselves) arrived to twelve years of age, in studies, and a discipline, fitting them for the Ministry. Which Children, at their first entrance shall receive tonsure, and always wear a *Clergy* habit; for the maintenance of whom, the *Bishop*, with four of the *Clergy* joined with him, are to detract a certain portion from the *Bishop's* Revenue, and all the *Benefices* of the *Dioceſs*, and the care of seeing this Order executed by the *Bishop*, committed to the *Provincial* Council.

§. 231. 6. Again, It is ordered, *Sess.* 5. *c.* 1. —— *Ne Coelestis ille sacrorum librorum Thesaurus, quem Spiritus Sanctus summa liberalitate hominibus tradidit, neglectus jaceat* (saith the Council) *Divinity-Lectures*, for the expounding of the *Holy Scriptures*, where these yet wanting, should be set up in all *Cathedral*, and *Collegiate* Churches; in the Convents of *Regulars*, and publick *Schools* of learning; and in poorer Churches, at least a School-Master founded, to teach *Grammer*: All such Lectures to be approved by the *Bishop:* And for their Maintenance, the first vacant *Prebend*, or a simple *Benefice*, or a Contribution from all the Benefices of such a City, or Dioceſs, to be applied to this use. All these Constitutions made for a better Provision for the future, of a learned and vertuous Clergy.

7. Lastly; For introducing amongst this *Clergy* a greater *strictness* and *Holiness* of *Life*; This Council revives and gives vigour to all the former rigid ancient *Canons*; notwithstanding whatever present, contrary customs, with the same or greater penalties to be inflicted on offenders, at the arbitrament of the *Ordinary*; and that, without admitting any appeals from his Censures. See, *Sess.* 22. *c.* 1. *de Reform.* —— *Statuit S. Synodus, ut quæ alias a Summis Pontificibus, & a sacris Conciliis de Clericorum vita, honestate, cultu, doctrinaque retinenda, ac simul, de luxu, comessationibus, choreis, aleis, lusibus, ac quibuscunque criminibus, nec non secularibus negotiis, fugiendis, copiose ac salubriter sancita fuerunt, eadem in posterum, iisdem panis, vel majoribus, arbitrio Ordinarii*

dinarii imponendis, observentur: nec Appellatio executionem hanc, quæ ad morum correctionem pertinet, suspendat; Si qua vero ex his [Sancitis] *in desuetudinem abiisse compererint* [Ordinarii], *ea quamprimum in usum revocari, & ab omnibus accurate custodiri, studeant, non obstantibus consuetudinibus quibuscunque; ne subditorum neglectæ emendationis ipsi condignas, Deo vindice, pœnas persolvant.* This heavy charge have the Bishops in this Council laid upon Bishops concerning reformation of the inferior Clergy.

§. 232. To λ.

To λ. *Pluralities*, and possessing superfluous wealth: It is ordered, *Sess.* 24. *c.* 17. That no person for the future (*Cardinals* themselves not excepted) shall hold two *Bishopricks*, or other *Ecclesiastical Benefices*, either *simple*, if one of them sufficient to maintain him, or *with cure*, and requiring *residence*, on any terms whatever; and that all, having such *Pluralities*, shall, within six months, quit one, all former Dispensations, or unions for life, notwithstanding; and, if this not done within such time, they to lose both; pronounced, then, to be vacant, and disposed of, otherwise: *A Rule, in Benefices requiring Residence, still religiously observed*, saith *Pallavicino* † (one who well knew the *Pope*'s Court) replying to *Soave*, † who saith, *this Canon was too good to be kept, save in the poorer sort.* And for other simple Benefices without Cure, as it is granted, that many are still possessed by one, and the same Person; so is this a thing permitted by this Rule, where one such living is sufficient for his maintenance.

† *l.* 23. *c.* 11. *n.* 8.
† *P.* 792.

§. 233.

Mean-while: For the Moderation also of this Clergy-maintenance; the Council, *Sess.* 25. *c.* 1. layes a charge, ascending from *Parish-Priests* to *Bishops*, and *Cardinals*, that, according to the ancient *Canons*, † none spend more of the Church-Revenue upon themselves, than their Condition necessarily requires; nor bestow the remainder thereof on any of their Secular Relations, further than the relieving them, when, and as, *poor*; but expend it on those pious uses (*viz.* for maintenance of *Holy Persons*, and *things*; and the *poor*) to which it is dedicated. Its words there are —— *Sancta Synodus, exemplo Patrum nostrorum in Concilio* Carthaginensi, *non solum jubet, ut Episcopi modesta supellectile, & mensa, ac frugali victu, contenti sint; verum etiam in reliquo vitæ genere, ac tota ejus domo, caveant, ne quid appareat, quod a sancto hoc Instituto sit alienum, quodque, non simplicitatem, Dei zelum, ac vanitatum contemptum, præ se ferat. Omnino vero eis interdicit, ne ex reditibus Ecclesiæ consanguineos, familiaresve suos, augere studeant; cum &* Apostolorum Canones *prohibeant, ne res Ecclesiasticas, quæ Dei sunt, consanguineis donent; sed, si pauperes sint, iis, ut pauperibus, distribuant: Eas autem non distrahant, nec dissipent, illorum causa: Immo quam maxime potest, eos sancta Synodus monet, ut omnem humanum hunc erga fratres, nepotes, propinquosque carnis affectum, unde multorum malorum in ecclesia seminarium extat, penitus deponant:* —— *Quæ vero de Episcopis dicta sunt, eadem non solum in quibuscunque Beneficia Ecclesiastica, tam secularia, quam regularia obtinentibus, pro gradus sui conditione, observari, sed & ad sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ Cardinales pertinere, decernit*, &c. And see, *Sess.* 22. *c.* 11. Therefore also it was anciently decreed: || That, a Clergyman having an Estate of his own, It, and the profits thereof, should be kept distinct from their *Church-means*; That, in leaving their own to their Secular Heirs;

† *Conc. Car.* 4. *c.* 15. *Can. Apostol.* 39, 40, 75. *Con. Antioc. c.* 25. ---- *Gratian. Caus.* 12. *q.* 1, 2. *De Rebus Ecclesiis dispensandis.*

|| *Canon. Apost.* 40. ---- *Concil. Agathens. c.* 48. *& Gratian. caus.* 12. *q.* 1.

Heirs; the reſt, whether Lands, Rents, Tithes, or Oblations, ſhould be preſerved for the uſes of the *Church:* Where (occaſionally) may be conſidered the great difficulty married *Prieſts* would undergo to be faithful to ſuch a truſt; and, to ſpend no more of the Church's Revenue on ſo near Relations, as Wife, and Children, than what may relieve their neceſſities in ſuch a manner, as doth thoſe of the *poor.*

§. 234. To the ſame end, the Council, *Seſſ.* 14. *c.* 6. preſcribes to the *Clergy* not to wear any *Laical Habit,* —— *Pedes in diverſis ponentes, unum in divinis, alterum in carnalibus*; but a *Clerical,* ſuting to their Order, upon pain of the ſequeſtring, and, if they continue obſtinate, Privation of their Benefices. Again, *Seſſ.* 22. *c.* 1. Renews the obſervance of all thoſe former Church-Canons; —— *Quæ de luxu, comeſſationibus, choreis, aleis, luſibus, ac quibuſcunque criminibus, nec non ſecularibus negotiis, fugiendis, copioſe, ac ſalubriter ſancita fuerunt, iisdem panis, vel majoribus, arbitrio Ordinarii imponendis:* And, that no appeal ſhould fruſtrate the execution of theſe laws, which belong to the correction of manners.

§. 235. To *μ. Non-Reſidence.* In *Seſſ.* 23. *c.* 1. —— And, —— *Seſſ.* 6. *c.* 1, 2.

To *μ.* 1ſt. It is declared by the Council: That neither *Biſhops,* nor inferior *Clergy,* enjoying any Benefice with *Cura animarum,* may be abſent from their charge at any time, without a juſt cauſe; and, that by their long, and cauſeleſs abſence, they incur *mortal ſin.* 2ly, As to *Biſhops*; for the abſence of two months, or, at the moſt, three in the year, the Council leaves the Examen of this juſt cauſe of ſuch abſence to their conſcience, *Quam ſperat, religioſam, & timoratam fore; cum Deo Corda pateant, cujus opus non fraudulenter agere, ſuo periculo tenetur*; yet admoniſheth them eſpecially to forbear this abſence, as to *Advent, Lent, the Feaſts of the* Nativity, *and* Reſurrection, Penteceſt, *and* Corpus Chriſti. 3ly, But then, ordered; That none, whether *Biſhop,* or alſo *Cardinal,* exceed ſuch time of two or three months in the year, except upon a cauſe allowed, under their hand, by the *Pope,* or the *Metropolitan*; or, for the *Metropolitan*'s abſence, by the Senior *Reſident-Biſhop* of the Province; the *Provincial* Council being impowred to ſee to it, that there be no abuſes committed in ſuch Licenſes; and that the due penalties be executed on the faulty. 4ly, As for *Prieſts* having *cure*; the *Biſhop* may prohibit their abſence for any time, exceeding two or three days, unleſs they have a licenſe under his hand for it, upon ſome cauſe approved; Nor yet is ſuch licenſe for *juſt cauſe* to be granted them, for above two months, unleſs this be very preſſing, —— *Diſcedendi autem licentiam, ultra biméſtre tempus, niſi ex gravi cauſa, non obtineant.* 5ly, Among *juſt Cauſes* of abſence, as the Congregation of *Cardinals* hath interpreted the Council, ſuch as theſe are not allowed; * want of a Houſe; * a Suit in Law about the living; * a perpetual ſickneſs; or, if it not ſuch, as that, for the Cure thereof, either Medicines, or a Phyſitian, is wanting in the place of Reſidence; upon which, abſence may be conceded for three or four months, if neceſſity require ſo much; * An unhealthful Air of the place, to one bred elſewhere; unleſs this air ſuch only for ſome certain time; * abſence deſired for Study; for a ſufficiency of learning is ſuppoſed to be found, by the Examiners, in ſuch

ſuch perſons, when elected: * Their being *Officials* of the *Pope*, or employed in ſome ſervice of the *Biſhop*, or *Cathedral* Church; unleſs it be their aſſiſtance of him in the Viſitation; * The living at a diſtance three or four miles off, and viſiting his Church, every Lord's day. Theſe, I ſay, and ſome others are held no juſt cauſes, for which Reſidence may be diſpenſed with. 6ly, Where ſuch Reſidence is, for a time, juſtly diſpenſed with, the *Biſhop* is to take care, that, in ſuch abſence, an able *Vicar* be ſubſtituted with a ſufficient allowance out of the Profits, by the *Biſhop*'s arbitration. 7ly, The penalty of Abſence, that is not thus allowed, is Sequeſtration of Profits for time of abſence: to be applied, by the Eccleſiaſtical Superior, to pious uſes; Or, in ſuch abſence continued above a year, and further contumacy ſhewed, when admoniſhed thereof, Ejectment out of ſuch Biſhoprick, or Living; The former to be done by the *Pope*, whom the *Metropolitan*, or Senior *Biſhop*-Reſident, is obliged to inform thereof by Letter, or Meſſenger, within three months; the latter, by the *Ordinary*. 8ly, All former Exemptions, or Privileges, for non-reſidence, abrogated. See alſo the like ſtrictneſs concerning the Reſidence of the *Canons* of *Cathedral* Churches, and *Perſonal* performance of their Church-Offices, *Seſſ.* 24. *c.* 12.

To *v.* The *want* of frequent *Preaching*, and *Catechiſing*: As the Council orders, *Seſſ.* 23. *c.* 14. That the *Biſhops* take care, that the *Prieſts* on every *Sunday*, and ſolemn *Feſtival*, celebrate *Maſs*; ſo concerning *Preaching*, *Seſſ.* 5. *c.* 2. and *Seſſ.* 24. *c.* 4. They do declare it to be the chief Office of a *Biſhop*, and enjoyn it to be performed by him in the *Cathedral*, and by other inferior *Clergy*, having care of Souls, in their Pariſhes, at leaſt, on all *Lord*'s *dayes*, and *ſolemn Feſtivals*; Or, if the *Biſhop* be ſome way letted, that he cannot do it himſelf; then, that he procure another to do it, at his charge; as alſo, if the *Rector* of a Pariſh be hindred, or do neglect ſuch office, the *Biſhop* is to ſubſtitute another to ſupply it, appointing to him part of the Profits. In which Sermons, the Council enjoyns; —*Ut plebes ſibi commiſſas, pro ſua, & earum capacitate, paſcant, ſalutaribus verbis; docendo, quæ ſcire omnibus neceſſarium eſt ad ſalutem; annunciandoque, eis cum brevitate, & facilitate ſermonis, vitia, quæ eos declinare, & virtutes, quas ſectari oporteat, ut pœnam æternam evadere, & cæleſtem gloriam conſequi, valeant.* The *Biſhop* alſo is to take care, that in time of *Advent*, and *Lent*, in ſuch places as he thinks it meet, Sermons be had *every* day, or *three* times a week: and in theſe things the *Biſhop* hath power to compel, if need be, with Eccleſiaſtical Cenſures. §. 236. *n.* 1. To *v.*

The *Biſhop* is to take care alſo; That, at leaſt on every *Lord*'s *day*, and other *Feſtivals*, the *Prieſt* do *catechiſe* the Children of his Pariſh, and teach them the Principles of their faith, and obedience to God, and their Parents: Finally, *Seſſ.* 24. *c.* 7. —— and *Seſſ.* 22. *c.* 8. to ſee to it; That, before the Sacraments be adminiſtred, the force, and uſe of them be explained to the people in the *vulgar tongue*; and that the *Catechiſm*, to be ſet forth by the *Council*, be alſo faithfully tranſlated into the *Vulgar*, and expounded to the people by their Paſtors; and that alſo, in the celebrati- §. 236. *n.* 2.

on of the *Mass*, and other Divine Service, —— *Sacra eloquia, & salutis monita eadem vernacula lingua, singulis diebus festis, vel solemnibus, explanentur*; That the Holy Scriptures, and instructions necessary for Salvation, be explained to them on all Holidays, and solemn Festivals, in the vulgar tongue; without handling any unprofitable matter, or question.

§. 237. Thus, there remaining no more obligation on the Church, than to render so much of divine matters, or exercises, intelligible to the common people, as is necessary for them to know, or practise; and this abundantly performed; the Council, notwithstanding earnest petitions to the contrary, saw much reason, to retain in the *Latin* Church the same constancy, as is found in the *Greek*; and to continue the Divine Service still in the same language, and words, without any alteration, in which their Ancestors had delivered it to them, and in which it had descended, to these, from all former ages (as for this Western Church) ever since that, next to the Apostles times. Neither doth this, or the following Ages seem imprudently to have chosen, for this service, the *most common* language, in the understanding whereof all these Nations are united, and concur: So that, however any removed their Station, they might still find the Divine Service both in matter, and words, the same; and any *Priest*, however he changed his Residence, be able to serve the people in it.

§. 238. To ξ. The *Clergies* being *restrained* from *Marriage*, and living *continently*.

To ξ. 1st. The Council, retaining the ancient doctrine of the Church, so expounding the Scriptures, † holds: That *Continency* is a Grace, or Gift, which, though not actually possessed by all, yet is denied, by God, to none, who, with using due means, and preparations thereto, seek it of him; the using of which means is a thing in every ones power (in such ordinary sence, as other humane actions are said to be.) 2ly, That *Continency* being thus, by every one, either possessed, or attainable, the *vow* of perpetual *Celibacy* is lawful; which is a thing seconded by the universal practice of the Religious, or *Monasticks*, as well in the *Eastern*, as *Western*, Church: all of them making such a vow. 3ly, Holds; That such *Celibacy*, attainable, and observable by all, may be lawfully enjoyned, and imposed, by the Church, on some; *viz.* such, as shall desire to enter into the *Priestly* Function, for many weighty reasons; and particularly, for those given by the Apostle, 1 *Cor.* 7. 28, 32, 34, 35, 38. —— *Ut non habeant tribulationem carnis*, —— *ut sint sine* [mundana] *solicitudine* —— *ut sint sancti & corpore, & spiritu*, —— *ut faciant, non bene, sed melius*: Whilst, mean-while, none at all are compell'd absolutely either to become *Priests*; or, in order to it, to profess *Celibacy*: (but only; that if they are desirous of the one, they must undergo the burden of the other): nor none instructed, that God's Law, but only the Church's Constitution, doth require it of them. 4ly, The Council had also, in this matter, the warrantable Precedent of former ages, both in the *Occidental*, and *Oriental*, Churches, so far; as that none at all, entring into the holy *Order* of *Priesthood*, in either Church, hath been hitherto permitted, *after*, to marry. 5ly, The Council,

† *Matt.* 19, 11.---1 *Cor.* 7. 78, &c.

Council, injoyning this, doth not deny this *Celibacy* of the *Clergy*, (as being only Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution) to be *diſpenſable*. And, though the Council it ſelf thought not fit to give ſuch diſpenſation, eſpecially ſince thoſe *Princes*, and their *Prelats* in the Council, whoſe Kingdoms remained untainted with *Proteſtantiſm*, oppoſed it. (See *Soave p.* 688, and 690. Where he ſaith, *That the King of* Spain, *and his Prelats, had neither Intereſt* [*i. e.* out of any neceſſary compliance with Sects] *nor affection, to proſecute the three Inſtances of the* Marriage *of* Prieſts, *Communion of the* Cup, *and uſe of the* Vulgar Tongue: Yet neither doth the Council *prohibit* any ſuch diſpenſation, if at any time, circumſtances conſidered, it ſhall ſo ſeem good to the *Pope*. And ſo he, after the Council ended, was, both by the *Emperor*, and the Duke of *Bavaria*, much ſollicited for it, † I mean, for a toleration of it in their Dominions; being in hopes of reclaiming thereby ſome of their Sectariſts. But, both the *Emperor*'s death, following ſhortly after, hindred the further proſecution of it; and the *Pope* ſeemed very averſe from gratifying any Prince with ſuch an indulgment, of which he knew not, where it would ſtop; nor how far it might draw on Petitions from other places, in the ſame, or alſo in other, matters; and thoſe, perhaps, of much more prejudice to the Church's welfare. In which thing, *Soave* alſo || is pleaſed to recommend the *Pope*'s prudence therein.

† See *Soave*, *p.* 823, 824. *Pallav. l.* 24. *c.* 12. *n.* 9.

|| *P.* 690.

§. 239. A Diſpenſation therefore in this matter, though lawful, neither the *Council*, nor *Pope*, to whom ſuch power was left, thought expedient. But the Parochial *Clergy*, by reaſon of their Secular employment, and converſe, being much more expoſed, than Regulars, to the breach of this holy Reſolution of perpetual Continency in a ſingle life, and by their fall herein, highly offending God, and alſo bringing great ſcandal on their ſacred Profeſſion, the Council, *Seſſ.* 25. *c.* 14. made the ſtricteſt laws, that could well be deviſed, againſt any ſuch miſcarriage; prohibiting *Prieſts* to keep any women, of whom might be reaſonable ſuſpicion, either in their houſe, or abroad; or to have any converſe with ſuch: Among which ſuſpitious perſons, ſaith the third Canon of the *Council* of *Nice*, are to be reckoned all: *Niſi Mater, aut Soror, aut Avia, aut Avita, vel Matertera, ſit. In his namque ſolis perſonis, & harum ſimilibus, omnis quæ ex mulieribus eſt ſuſpitio, declinatur:* which Canon the 3d. *Carthag.* Council thus expoundeth, or inlargeth, —— *Sorores & filiæ fratrum, aut ſororum, & quæcunque ex familia, domeſtica neceſſitate, etiam antequam ordinarentur jam cum eis habitabant; vel ſi filii eorum, jam ordinatis Parentibus, uxores acceperunt, aut ſervis, non habitantibus in domo, quas ducant, aliunde ducere, neceſſitas ſuit.*

§. 240. Next the Council ordaineth: That the faulty herein, after the firſt admonition by the *Biſhop*, ſhould loſe the third part of the profits of their Benefice; and after the ſecond, not amending it, *all*; and further ſhould be ſuſpended from officiating; And, after diſobeying a third admonition, ſhould be *ejected out of* their Living, and made incapable of another. And the *Biſhop* to proceed herein, without any formal Conviction in Court, ſo the verity of the fact were ſufficiently proved to him. Their Concubines

bines alſo, by the aid of the Secular Power, to be expelled the Town, or the Dioceſs. [And *Seſſ.* 21. *c.* 6. the ſame power of Ejection of the *Clergy*, when found incorrigible, the *Biſhops* have, as to any other great and ſcandalous faults, without the relief of any Exemptions or Appeals.] But if a *Biſhop* were ſo faulty; after an admonition, from the *Provincial* Synod, if no amendment, he was to be ſuſpended; and, ſtill continuing ſo, the ſame Synod to inform the *Pope* thereof; and he to proceed to the Depoſition of him from his Biſhoprick: the Council providing alſo, that this their Conſtitution ſhould not hinder the force and execution of any former Laws, or Canons, made for the correction of ſuch Crime.

§. 241. To π. *With-holding the Communion of the* Cup. 1ſt, The Council, *Seſſ.* 21. *c.* 1. following the cuſtom, and judgement, of former Churches, declares: That there is no Divine Precept, that obligeth all Communicants to receive in both kinds; ſince the frequent practice of Antiquity, to ſome perſons, in ſome places, adminiſtred it only in one kind, when yet there was a poſſibility (though not convenience) of doing it in both: and eſteemed this a ſufficient, and lawful, Communion, and no way offending againſt any command of our Lord, enjoyning the contrary. 2ly, It is a thing not denied by *Proteſtants*, that Chriſt, now no more diviſible, is totally contained in, or exhibited by, every particle of either Symbol. 3ly, Theſe things ſuppoſed; the Council maintains, *Ib. c.* 12. that the Church did not change the former ordinary cuſtom of receiving in both kinds, without great, and juſt cauſe, moving her thereto. 4ly, But yet the Council grants alſo; That ſome juſt Motives there may be for reſtoring the uſe of the Cup; eſpecially as to ſome particular places, or perſons; and, laſtly, referreth the judgement of theſe, and Conceſſion of it, to the *Pope*'s prudence; the impediment, that no ſuch *Diſpenſation* was conceded by the Council it ſelf (upon ſo much importunity, uſed by ſeveral Princes, who having their States much embroiled with new Sects, hoped, by this way, to give them ſome ſatisfaction) being this; That the Fathers in the Council did not unanimouſly concur in the ſame judgement, but the *Spaniſh* Biſhops, chiefly, made great oppoſition to it: as they not having the ſame motives, which others, for ſuch an alteration; and much fearing, leſt ſome Diviſion might happen between National Churches from the Communion celebrated, in a ſeveral manner. †† Neither were the reſt willing to paſs ſuch an Act, with the diſpleaſure of ſo conſiderable a party. Though (if we may believe *Soave*) the Legats of the *Pope*, then *Pius* the Fourth, (who of himſelf alſo was well inclined to grant it ††) laboured much for the Conceſſion of it; ‖ Of which Conceſſion theſe conditions alſo were propoſed by ſome in the Council, †—— *That the* Cup *ſhould never be carried out of the Church: and that the Bread only ſhould be ſufficient for the ſick; that it ſhould not be kept, to take away the danger of its ſowring; that they ſhould uſe little pipes to avoid effuſion, as was formerly done in the* Roman *Church.* And when it could not be paſſed in the Council, *Pro*, being ſtrongly oppoſed (as was ſaid) by the *Spaniſh* Biſhops, and others, where the Reformed Religion had taken no root, it was with much diligence,

To π.

†† See *Soave*, p. 459.

†† See *Soave*, p. 459.

‖ *Soave*, p. 567.

† *Soave*, p. 525.

gence, by the ſame Legats, procured, that it ſhould not be voted *contra*; but referred to the *Pope*; and this reference alſo firſt was drawn up with a clauſe, of the Council's approbation of the Conceſſion thereof, if he ſo pleaſed, in this manner, ‖ *That, ſince the Council could not at preſent determine ſuch affair, They remitted it to the judgement of his Holineſs: who, premiſing the diligences that he thought fit, ſhould either with the Conditions forementioned, or ſome other, according to his prudence, allow the uſe thereof, if it ſhould ſeem good to him, with the vote and approbation of the Council.* But neither would ſuch clauſe paſs, (See *Soave*, p. 569.) But to the *Pope*, at laſt, it was referred, unbyaſſed any way by the Council, to do that in it, —— *Quod utile Reipublicæ Chriſtianæ, & ſalutare petentibus uſum Calicis, fore judicaverit.* †

‖ *Apud Pall. l.* 18. *c.* 7. *n.* 13.

† *Conc. Trid. Seſſ.* 22. *fin.* §. 242.

And ſo it was, that, after the Council ended, the *Pope*, upon the Petition of the *Emperor*, and ſome others, ‖ granted the uſe of the *Cup* to ſome parts of *Germany*. Though this practice, not having ſuch effect as was hoped, for reducing Sectariſts (as who differed from *Catholicks* in ſo many other points; for which, though they ſeem to have leſs pretence, yet they did retain, in them, no leſs obſtinacy) neither did it continue long amongſt the *Catholicks*; who deſired, in this matter, to conform to the reſt of the Church. The ſame practice was likewiſe indulged formerly by *Popes* to the *Greeks* & *Polonia*, to the *Maronites*, and others, reconciled to the Church of *Rome*, that they ſhould ſtill receive the *Sacrament* in both kinds, after their former manner; *viz.* the Body of our Lord inſtinct in the Blood, and both delivered them out of the *Chalice* in a Spoon. Indulged alſo by Pope *Paul* the third, † in the Ceſſation of the Council, to thoſe in *Germany*, who ſhould humbly demand it, nor did condemn the Church's contrary practice; and, ſo that it were done, neither in the ſame time, nor place, with that [Communion] which is given by decree of the Church; this caution, I ſuppoſe, being inſerted, to avoid the offence, which others, communicating only in one kind, might take thereat. Indulged alſo formerly to the *Bohemians*, and *Moravians* by the Council of *Baſil* (See *Hiſtor. Bohem. apud Æneam Silvium, c.* 52. —— *His* [Boemis & Moravis] *qui conſueviſſent, ſub bina ſpecie, panis ſcilicet & vini, divinæ Euchariſtiæ communicare licebit.* And, ſhould any *Pope* or *Council* reſtore the uſe of the *Cup* generally to the whole Church, yet can this no way infer any variation of the Church's Faith, or Confeſſion of her former Error. For in ſuch matters of practice, where no divine precept confineth us to any ſide, the doing one thing is far from inferring a confeſſion of the unlawfulneſs of having done the contrary; unleſs the *Pope*, or *Council*, ſhould reſtore the *Cup* upon this reaſon, becauſe our Lord hath *expreſly commanded it*. But then, as this would ſhew a fault, ſo it would no leſs condemn the practice of Antiquity, than the preſent.

‖ *Soave*, p. 823.

† *Soave*, p. 293, & 524.

To *f*. The too much *frequency* of *Excommunication*. See the Proviſion made by the Council againſt it, *Seſſ.* 25. *De Reform. Gener. c.* 3. Excommunication to be forborn, where any other puniſhment, effective, can be inflicted.

§. 243. *n.* 1.

To *f*.

To *g*.

§. 243. *n.* 2. To σ. *Diſorders of Monaſticks.* See the reformation of them delivered, *Seſſ.* 25. in 22. Chapters. Wherein, amongſt other things, it is ordered:

To σ. * That frequent *Viſitations* be made of ſuch *Houſes* for the ſtrict obſervance of their *Rule*; and, for this purpoſe, thoſe *Houſes*, formerly ſubjected immediately to the *Pope*, are ſubmitted to the *Biſhop*, as his Delegate. * That none living in any ſuch Houſes retain any *Propriety:* nor any *ſuperfluous expence* be made therein, not ſuting to the vow of Poverty. * That *Monaſticks* never depart from their Convent, for the ſervice of any place, or perſon, or any pretence of other employment whatſoever, without a *Licenſe* obtained in writing from their Superior; otherwiſe, to be puniſhed by the *Biſhop*, as *Deſertors* of their Profeſſion. * That none ſhall have leave to wear their Habit ſecretly. None be permitted to depart, from an Order more ſtrict, to one of more liberty. * That the *Biſhop* take care, That any offending ſcandalouſly out of his Convent receive due puniſhment. * That all Superiors, and Officers be elected by ſecret ſcrutiny. * That no Eſtate, or Goods of any Novice (ſave for his food and apparel) be received by any Monaſtery before his Profeſſion, that ſo, after his Noviceſhip ended, he may retain a perfect freedom to depart, if ſo inclined. For *Religious Houſes* of *Women:* * That none either receive the *Habit*, or *profeſs* without being firſt examined by the *Biſhop*, concerning her willingneſs, and free inclination, thereto. * That in ſuch Houſes, moſt ſtrict *clauſure* be obſerved. None to *go forth* on what occaſion ſoever, without the *Biſhop* be firſt acquainted therewith, and *licenſe* it: None, of what ſex, or age ſoever, to *enter in*, without the licence of the *Biſhop*, or *Superioreſs:* All ſuch *Votaries* enjoyned to *Confeſs*, and *Communicate*, at leaſt *once a month*, —— *Ut* †*eo ſalutari præſidio ſe muniant* (ſaith the Council) †*ad omnes oppugnationes Dæmonis fortiter ſuperandas.* Theſe, and many other like, Conſtitutions were paſſed by this Synod of *Biſhops*, for the reforming of *Monaſticks:* the effect of which *Decrees*, ſince the time of this Council, hath been very great, both as to removing much former *ſcandal*, and reſtoring *Diſcipline* relaxed.

† *De Refor. Reg.* c. 10.

And perhaps if ſome *Religious* Houſes, that now lie in aſhes, had but ſtood, till theſe Decrees of *Trent* might have been applied to their great diſtempers, theſe ſevere remedies might have healed thoſe *Corruptions*, for which, ſtill more and more putrifying, and increaſing, it is to be feared, the hand of *God*'s *Juſtice* cut them off.

§. 243. *n.* 3. To τ. *Correction* of the Breviary and Miſſal, See, *Seſſ.* 25. *Decret. de Brev.* Where the Council, having committed this affair to certain Selected Fathers,

To τ. and being neceſſitated to conclude, before it was finiſhed, leave the care of it to the *Pope*; after which, the ſame Fathers, with ſome others joined to them, ſtill proſecuting it in *Pius* the Fourths days, both the *Miſſal*, and *Breviary* thus corrected, and reduced to a greater uniformity, were licenſed and publiſhed by his Succeſſor, *Pius* the Fifth.

§. 244. Thus I have run through many particulars, wherein the wiſdom, and diligence of this Council (joined, in the *later*, and *Principal*, actions thereof, with a *Pope* much inclined the ſame way, and alſo much ſwayed by his holy Nephew *Carlo Borromeo*) endeavoured to repair the defects obſerved, and

ſcandals

ſcandals complained of, in the former Eccleſiaſtical Government, and Diſcipline. By which it is clear, that many things are reduced into a much better order ſince this Council, than they were in before; and the oppoſition of many enemies ſearching into the faults of thoſe times, (by the Divine Providence bringing good out of evil) conduced much to the rectifying of them; and the pretended *Reformation from* the Church produced a true one in it. And if, after all this, ſome blemiſhes do ſtill remain, 1ſt, It muſt be conſidered; * That ſome things the Council could have wiſhed amended, and altered, which yet were too difficult to be brought about, without hazarding *ſchiſm* amongſt the *National* Churches, or Prelats, long enured to different Cuſtoms: And, * That ſeveral things alſo had dependence on the Reformation of the Secular Governors; which when the Council touched upon, though very tenderly, and drew up ſome Articles concerning it, but ſuch as were decreed both by former Church-Canons, and the Imperial Laws ||, preſently the *Princes* grew diſpleaſed: and ſo, for fear of alienating their minds, to whoſe favours, otherwiſe, the Church ſtands much obliged and by whoſe ſword (under the Divine Providence) ſhe is upheld, the Council was forced to bear with their *weakneſs*, and deſiſt from its purpoſe. Review the Council's complaint ſet down before, §. 210. ——*Adeo dura, difficiliſque eſt Preſentium temporum conditio*, &c. 2ly, Again; It may be conſidered; That ſeveral things, that were well ordered by the Council, yet are not ſo well executed: nor ought the *Council* to be charged at all with this, but its *Miniſters*; who as they ſhall happen to be more, or leſs active, or piouſly diſpoſed, ſo its conſtitutions in all future ages will receive vigor, or languiſh; And, in this, its *Laws* do only ſuffer the common Fate of all others, made heretofore either in the *Eccleſiaſtical*, or *Civil*, States; No Court hitherto having been able to deviſe a law, that could infallibly promote the *Execution* of their *Laws*, or of *It ſelf*. 3ly, After this, to be conſidered yet much more; that, if every thing, which *private judgements* (amongſt which every one is to reckon his own) do think fit to be corrected, was not thought ſo by the Council, they ought rather, with an undiſputing humility, to ſubmit theſe to that of ſo Reverend an Aſſembly, than to cenſure it, as not conformable to theirs, and that too, as to matters, not received, or rejected by this Council, but after that all ſides had been much diſputed, and weighed. Eſpecially they ought to ponder well theſe two things.

|| *Soave, p.* 769. *Pallav. l.* 23. *c.* 4. *n.* 6.

§. 245. 1.

The one, Concerning the *Council* of *Trent* its differing in ſome practices from what was obſerved in the *antient* Church; That all the ſame *Conſtitutions* do not fit *all* times, where the circumſtances of things are much varied, the former manners much relaxed, the Chriſtian Profeſſion much enlarged, the Civil Governments much altered, *&c.* Nor is one age of the world (no more, than of a man) in every thing, to be treated, as the precedent: Nor are the Diſtempers of Chriſtianity in all times ſo agreeable in their nature, as to be cured ſtill with the ſame Medicines: And ſeveral projects, that ſeem very beneficial in the Speculation, yet, in the Experience, and Practice, by not finding ſuch an indifferent matter to work

upon, as is ſuppoſed, would have a quite contrary effect; and, inſtead of better *order*, bring in *Confuſion*, in removing what *good* was before, and being unable to eſtabliſh any *thing* better; A thing often preſſed in the Council, in anſwer to thoſe, who would have every thing reſtored according to the Model of *Antiquity*.

§. 246. 2. The other, concerning that *Super-eminent power* in ſeveral particulars, which as it was found, ſo was left ſtill, by the *Council*, in the hands of the *Biſhop* of *Rome*; That, as by the *Church-Canons* anciently he hath poſſeſſed it, ſo it ought, if either, rather to be increaſed than any way diminiſhed, in theſe later times: when the *Chriſtian Churches* now much more enlarged, and extended, and ſeparated, under ſo many ſeveral *Secular* Heads, and ſo both by their bulk, and different temporal Intereſts, more ſubject to *divide*, and to fall aſunder, one from another; therefore we have much more need of a firm *union* in one Spiritual Head, and ſuch Juriſdictions and Privileges to be enjoyed by him, whereby *He* may have ſome influence upon the *whole Body*, and *It*, ſome neceſſary recourſe to, and dependance on, *Him*. As we ſee in *Civil* States, how ſtrictly upheld, and unviolably kept, are the *Prerogatives*, *Legiſlative*, *Diſpenſative*, *Donative*, Power of Princes, to keep the whole *Body* in a due dependance on a *Supreme*; and to ſecure the publick peace, and happineſs, in the beſt of Goverments, a *Monarchical* Regency.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIII.

Solutions of the Protestant Objections.

Brief answers to the Protestant Objections made before, §. 3. &c. —— §. 247. &c.

Where,

Of the Councils joining Apostolical Tradition with the Holy Scriptures as a Ground of Church-Definitions, §. 264.

§. 247.

HAving thus dispatched the five Heads, which I intended to speak of; I desire you now to review the objections, which were proposed in the beginning of this Discourse (§. 3. *&c.*) against this Council; which, for the most part, I think, now will appear to you to have their main force and sting already solved, and taken away.

To *α*. The words of *Bellarmine*, who is quoted *here* by the Archbishop, are not, *Ut ex omnibus Provinciis*; or (which is more) *from all particular Churches*, which the Archbishop saith: But —— *Ut saltem ex majori parte Christianarum Provinciarum aliqui conveniant.* See touching this matter, what is said before, §. 35, *&c.* —— 65, 66, 67, 69. Whether a *Council* be *General*; or, in its obligation, *equivalent* thereto, much matters not; that Council is equivalent to a *General*, whose Decrees are *accepted* by the *much major* part, * of the Catholick-Church, or * of all particular Churches in it. Now the *Greek* Churches do agree with the *Council* of *Trent*, in the chief points determined therein, against the *Reformed*. † —— Their Prelats also were invited in the General Summons; and the Council, or those who called it, no causers of their absence, but their great distance; their present secular poverty, and oppression: The open wars then between the *Turk* and *Christendom*. Lastly, the general accord and peace in these Churches, as to the *Trent-Controversies*.

To *α*

† See 3. *Disc.* §. 158, *&c.*

§. 248.

To *β*. See before, §. 70, 75, 77. The *paucity* of *Prelats* in some *Sessions* (occasioned by the long duration of the Council; by the wars, and jealousies of Princes, by the *Bishops* necessary defence of their several charges at home against the *reformed*, in *France* and *Germany*) was abundantly recompenced,* by the *ratification* of the Decrees of those *Sessions*, by a very numerous, and unanimous Body assembled in the latter end of the Council, and by the *acceptation* of the *absent* Prelats, after the Council.

To *β*

§. 249.

To *γ*. See what hath been said, §. 47, *&c.* 80, 81. It was *called*, as General Councils ought, and use, to be: namely by the *Prime Patriarch*, and chief Ecclesiastical Person of Christianity *presiding* in such Councils (as other inferior Councils are also usually assembled by the Ecclesiastical Prelats presiding

To *γ*

siding therein;) the *Emperor*, and much major part of *Christian Princes* consenting to it, desiring it, and sending their *Bishops*, and Orators to it.

§. 250. To ſ. This Title [*representing the Church Universal*] (never used by any *General* Council, save only by *Constance*, and *Basil*, who also decreed a General Council its *superiority* to the *Pope*) was opposed by the *Pope*, or his Legats; not because he held not this Council to be *General* or *Oecumenical*; for the title of it every where, with the *Pope*'s approbation, runs, —— *Hæc sacrosancta Oecumenica & Generalis Tridentina Synodus*; but because he held, no General *Council* whatever, neither that of *Trent*, nor that of *Nice*, to represent *the Universal Church exclusively* to him; *i. e.* so as to have authority to conclude, and oblige the whole Church by its *Acts*, without these Acts first receiving their *confirmation* from the *See Apostolick*. That this only was the Controversie, see witnessed by *Soave*, *p.* 138. Now this: *whether the Acts of a General Council, unconfirmed by the Prime Patriarch of the Church, be valid?* the Dr. knows hath always been a question among *Roman Catholicks*, and so hath that Proposition in him (*Hæres.* 11. *s.* 9. *n.* 10.) *Whether the Universal Church Representative understood so, as not including the Apostolick See, may err?* —— Or, *Whether the testimony of an Oecumenical Council, understood exclusively to the Apostolick See, be the testimony of the whole Church?* Which question as some of the *French* Church seem to affirm, so other Churches deny; neither was it decided in the Council of *Trent* (of which see what is said before, §. 155.) but yet, *de facto*, the *Pope*'s Confirmation was desired by this Council (see the last Act *Sess.* 25.) Neither doth this thing concern the Council of *Trent* more than any other *General Council*: Nor is the deciding of this question material to the *Protestants* concerning any such Council, whose *Acts* are confirmed by the *Pope*; in which the stating of this question surely is needless; whether such acts are also *of force without* the *Pope?*

To ſ.

§. 251. To ſ. See what is said, §. 67, 64. Neither doth the *absence* of *Protestant Clergy*, such as are *not Bishops*, dis-authorize the *Council*; for such have no right to sit, or vote in it: Nor the *voluntary absence* of *Protestant Bishops*, if invited; if secured; as they were. † Nor, lastly, the *exclusion*, or non-admittance of them; if guilty of *Tenents* censured and *condemned* by former lawful *Councils*: as many of the former *Protestant* Doctrines were: || The several causes, alledged by *Protestants* for absenting themselves, have been shewed in this discourse not *sufficient*, or satisfactory, from §. 82. to §. 122. and from §. 159. to §. 172.

To ſ.

† See §. 68. 82. &c. 92.

|| See §. 198.

To ζ. To ζ. review the answer to β. See the reason of the absence of the *French Bishops* in some *Sessions*, no way chargeable on the Council, or on the non-freedom thereof, before, §. 70, &c.

§. 252. To *n*. See what is said, §. 167. where is shewed; that the *nearness*, and non-impediment of the *Italian Bishops* by reason of the *freedom* of that Country from *Lutheranism*, and not any particular interest of theirs, thwarting the proceedings of the Council, was the true cause of their being so *numerous*. That the absence of other Bishops was culpable, but no way their presence: that the much major part of them were *Subjects* to *other Princes* (the

To *n*.

(the *Emperor*, King of *Spain*; Duke of *Florence*; the State of *Venice*, *&c.*) not the *Pope*; and did manifeſtly in the Council follow and adhere to their *Intereſts*, and *Inſtructions*, in ſeveral matters. That, as to the *Proteſtant Controverſies*, the *Pope* had no need of their aſſiſtance againſt the reſt, the whole *Council* in theſe *unanimouſly* according: and that, as to the conteſts between the *Epiſcopal* and *Papal* Rights, many of them ſided againſt him; which is every where ſhewed alſo in *Soave*'s Hiſtory, deſcribing the great perplexities, and Artifices of the *Pope*, and his Legats, in preſerving his pretended privileges, and not that they might be *confirmed* or aſſerted by the *Council*; but that, not *diminiſhed* or voted down by it. Laſtly, That, however ſuch a number of *Italian Biſhops* might hinder ſomething, prejudicial to the *Pope*, from being voted in the Council; yet were they *inſufficient* alone to vote any thing, or to paſs any *Decree*, at leaſt in matter of Doctrine, againſt the reſt; becauſe no ſuch things were valid, a conſiderable part diſſenting; as the *non-Italian*, or alſo the *Biſhops* of any one greater *Nation*, were granted to be.

To θ. See what is ſaid, §. 39, *&c.* 67. An *univerſal* Acceptation by all Churches of the Acts of a Council, to render them obliging, is *not neceſſary*; for ſo none would be valid, wherein the Doctrines of any *Church* are cenſured. To θ.

To κ. See what is ſaid, §. 77. Both the *Eccleſiaſtical*, and *Civil* State of *France* accepted the *Trent-Decrees* as to matter of *Doctrine*; the things, wherein *Proteſtants* chiefly oppoſe it. The Eccleſiaſtical State of *France* accepted, and petitioned the *King* and Civil State to receive, this Council alſo in points of *Diſcipline*. And if the *Civil* State received it not in every thing, I mean, ſo far, as it medled not with their *temporal* rights, I think, it appears, from the former Juſtification of the *Legality* of this Council, that they cannot be freed from fault: Neither, if that State refuſe theſe *Canons* of *Diſcipline*, will it juſtifie the *Proteſtants* for refuſing the reſt, of *Doctrine*: unleſs the *French* plead the Council totally illegal, as they do not; neither will it juſtifie the *Proteſtants*, at leaſt, in refuſing theſe; if the *French* do, *faultily*, refuſe them. §. 253. To κ.

To λ. See what is ſaid, from §. 113. to §. 127. where is ſhewed. 1ſt. *As to the Biſhops*; That the ſame plea hath been uſually made againſt *former* Councils by the *Hereticks*, they condemned. That the Chriſtian world was divided into *Arians*, and *Anti-Arians* before the *Council* of *Nice*, as it was into *Catholicks*, and *Proteſtants* before that of *Trent*; and the *Arians* were many wayes proceeded againſt, before the aſſembling of that Council, by ſome of thoſe *Biſhops*; who yet afterward ſat in Council as their *Judges*; and the *Anti-Arian Biſhops* only, as the *major number*, condemned the other. That the *Church-Governours*, whatever their perſwaſions are formerly known to be in the controverſie propoſed, cannot be removed from the *Tribunal*, for the deciding *purely Eccleſiaſtical*, and ſpiritual, matters; and this is only neceſſary (not, to ſee, whether they *ſide* any way, or own a party; but only) to ſee on which ſide is the *major* part: *That in cauſes of Religion, in which all men are concerned*, and the Clergy eſpecially ſtand obliged earneſtly §. 254. *n.* 1. To λ.

neſtly to defend the truth, and oppoſe Novelties, and are culpable in remaining neuters, and omitting this duty (to uſe Mr. *Chillingworth*'s words) *it is in a manner impoſſible to be avoided*, but that the *Judge* muſt be, ſome way or other, a *party*; if he may be called a party, who hath formerly declared himſelf of ſuch an opinion. But, if their being queſtioned of judging in their own cauſe, relate not here to matters of *opinion*, but of *honour*, or *profit*; then, for moſt matters defined in the Council of *Trent*, its judgment cannot be declined on this *later account*, being given in matters, meerly *ſpeculative*, or at leaſt, far remote from ſuch *Secular* concernments.

2ly, *As to the Pope*: That the ſame things may be repeated for *him*, as for the *Biſhops*. That *Popes* have often *preſided* by their Legats in former allowed Councils, when they were *accuſed*, and excepted againſt, by thoſe perſons, for the judging of whoſe cauſe the *Council* was convened: As *Celeſtine*, excepted againſt by *Neſtorius*, preſided in the *Third*, and *Leo*, by *Dioſcorus*, in the Fourth *General Council*. That it is thought moſt reaſonable, that the ſupreme *Civil* Judge, either by himſelf, or his Subſtitutes, be the Judge of all thoſe cauſes, which concern his *own Rights*, when there is a controverſie in theſe between him, and ſome of his Subjects. That, if the *Pope*, for defects in his *Office*, or other perſonal faults, be liable to any *other* Judge, it muſt be to the *Council*. Now by this Council he remaineth either cleared, or not condemned, as to the Accuſations of *Proteſtants*.

§. 254. *n.* 2. This having ever been the chief plea for thoſe, who foreſee, that they ſhall be over-numbred, and over-voted in a *Council* to alledge it to conſiſt of a *contrary Party*; and ſo to decline its judgment (for, uſually, no *Council* happens to be called for ſuppreſſing any new Doctrine, till a conſiderable oppoſition is firſt made by thoſe Paſtors of the Church againſt ſuch Doctrine, who alſo are the proper *Judges* of it:) I think it not amiſs, in the laſt place, to give you the judgment of *Proteſtants* themſelves touching the *inſufficiency* of ſuch an *excuſe*, when (by God's providence) it happened afterward to be their own caſe, in, I think, the moſt noted, and general Synod, that hath been held amongſt them ſince the *Reformation*; I mean, the *Synod* of *Dort*, aſſembled, *A. D.* 1618. Wherein were preſent *Delegats* from the *King* of *England*, Elector *Palatine*, *Landgrave* of *Heſs*, the four *Proteſtant Cantons* of the *Swiſſes*, the Commonwealth of *Geneva*, &c. For ſome time, great Controverſie had been in the *Low-Countrys* concerning the high points of Predeſtination, Grace, and Free-will; the *Paſtors* there divided into *Remonſtrants*, and *Contra-Remonſtrants*, the Conteſt proceeding ſo far in ſeveral places, as to a ſeparation of Communion. Upon it this National Synod is called, and the *Remonſtrants* in this of *Dort*, foreſeeing themſelves in the ſame condition, as the *Proteſtants* did in that of *Trent*, defended themſelves with the ſame Arts and Excuſes: †Alledged, that the Synod, excepting the Forrainers, did moſtly conſiſt (a thing which could not be denied) of an already declared *contrary Party*, who, it was unreaſonable, that they ſhould ſit *Judges* in their *own* cauſe; a party too, who had before alſo ſeparated themſelves from communicating with the *Remonſtrants*; and amongſt other things, thoſe *Remonſtrants* did particularly inſiſt upon this very plea, we are now ſpeaking to,

† See *Acta Synod. Dordrecht. Seſſ.* 25.

to, of the *Proteſtants* againſt the Council of *Trent*; which was held juſtly to exempt them from any obligation to its *Decrees*. They required alſo a Synod, as the *Proteſtants* did in the time of that of *Trent*, in which a *ſet* and *equal* number on either ſide might be choſen to conſider, how to *accommodate*, rather than *decide*, theſe Controverſies: After which, any *Clergy* diſſenting, being only removed from their places, might ſtill enjoy the ſame *liberty* of *Conſcience* as others: For that, ſince the *Apoſtles*, there was no ſuch infallible Guidance of the Holy Spirit, but that Modern Synods might *err*; as ſeveral Ancient had done. †

† See *Synod. Delf. Seſſ.* 26.

In anſwer to this; the Synod defends it ſelf (all the forrain Aſſiſtants thereof concurring in their judgment) with ſuch Replies as theſe, than which, only changing the name, I cannot imagine a better *juſtification* of the *Council* of *Trent*. 1ſt. Concerning the members of the Synod, their being of a contrary perſwaſion, and ſo a Party, and Judges in their own cauſe; They ſay (ſee *Acta Synod. Dordr. Seſſ.* 26. *p.* 84. *Nunquam praxin hanc Eccleſiarum fuiſſe; ut, Paſtores, quoties exorientibus erroribus, ex officio, ſeſe opponerent* [as the *Tridentine* Biſhops, before that Council, did] *propterea jure ſuffragiorum, aut de illis ipſis erroribus judicandi poteſtate, exciderent. Ita enim omnem everti judiciorum Eccleſiaſticorum ordinem; efficique, ne Paſtores officio ſuo fideliter fungi queant.* Again, p. 88. —— *Eos, qui in doctrina aut moribus ſcandalorum authores ſunt, ſemper Cenſores ſuos, Conſiſtoria, Claſes, Synodus, ſeu partem adverſam, rejicere.* —— *Ad eum modum, Arianis aliiſque olim hæreticis, adverſus Orthodoxos Paſtores ſemper licuiſſet excipere.* And, —— *Quo pacto* (ſay they) *iis Paſtores ſe neutros, ut loquuntur, præbebunt* (*Quando præſertim tam multi anni intercedunt, priuſquam legitimum & publicum Eccleſiæ judicium obtineri poteſt*) *quum Deus illis præcipiat, ut ſerio Doctrinæ ſinceritati attendant.*

The *Engliſh Divines* there deliver their judgments alſo in the ſame caſe very ſolidly. —— *Non valet* (ſay they) *ad Synodi hujus,* [but ſuppoſe they had ſaid *Tridentinæ*] *authoritatem enervandam, quod cauſentur Remonſtrantes maximam Synodi partem conſtare ex adverſariis ſuis: Neque naturale jus permittere, ut, qui adverſarius eſt, in cauſa ſua judex ſedeat.* 1. *Nam huic ſententiæ refragatur primo perpetua praxis omnium Eccleſiarum. Nam in Synodis Oecumenicis, Nicæno,* &c. *ii, qui antiquitus receptam doctrinam oppugnarunt, ab illis, qui eandem ſibi traditam admiſerunt, approbarunt, examinati, judicati, damnati ſunt.* 2. *Ipſius rei neceſſitas huc cogit. Theologi enim, in negocio Religionis, neque eſſe ſolent tanquam abraſæ tabulæ, neque eſſe debent. Si igitur ſoli neutrales poſſunt eſſe Judices, extra Eccleſiam, in qua lites enatæ ſunt, quærendi eſſent.* 3. *Ipſa æquitas hoc ſuadere videtur. Nam quæ ratio reddi poteſt, ut ſuffragiorum jure priventur omnes illi Paſtores, qui, ex officio, receptam Eccleſiæ doctrinam propugnantes, ſecus docentibus adverſati ſunt. Si hoc obtinuerit, nova dogmata ſpargentibus nemo obſiſteret, ne ipſo facto, jus omne poſt modum de illis controverſiis judicandi amitteret.* Enough of this.

§. 254. *n.* 3.

2. Again: For the *juſt* and *obliging* authority of this Council, and the *Credibility*, at leaſt of its not erring, they urge. † —— *Chriſtum Dominum, qui Apoſtolis promiſit Spiritum veritatis, Eccleſiæ quoque ſuæ pollicitum eſſe, ſe cum ea uſque ad finem ſæculi manſurum,* Matt. 28. 20. And, —— *Ubi duo*

§. 254. *n.* 4.

† See *Seſſ.* 26. *Syn. Delf.*

duo, aut tres in ipsius nomine congregati fuerint, se in eorum medio futurum, Matt. 18. 20. They urge the precept of the Apostle, 1 Cor. 14. 29, 31. —— *Ut judicetur de iis, quæ Prophetæ loquuntur:* And, —— *Prophetarum Spiritus prophetis subjecti sint.* And the *Geneva* Divines, *Sess.* 29. urge also, —— *Dic Ecclesiæ*, —— and —— *Si Ecclesiam non audiverit*, &c.

§. 254. *n.* 5. ——— || *Sess.* 25. *p.* 82.

3ly. In defence of the *Protestants* refusing submission to the Judgment of the *Council* of *Trent*, because it was a party, without their allowing the same privilege to the *Remonstrants*, for that of *Dort*, they answer, —— || *Valde disparem esse hanc comparationem. Illos enim* [the *Remonstrants*, and *Contra-Remonstrants*] *eidem subesse Magistratui.* And, —— *Remonstrantes membra esse Ecclesiarum Belgicarum, & Reformatarum.* See the same said again, *Sess.* 26. *p.* 85. But, according to this answer, the reason, why the *Protestants* denied their submission to the Council of *Trent* must not be, because it consisted of an *adverse party*, but because all its members were not *Subjects* of the *same* Prince; a thing never alledged before. But here I ask, Is there then, no preservation of the Church's unity by Synods, no subordination of *Clergy*, no rule of one party, the Superior and Major, judging another, the Inferior and Minor, any further, than only in such little parcels of the Church, as happen to live under the same Secular Governors? Are our *Lord*'s *Promises*, and, *Dic Ecclesiæ*, all confined to these? What will become of the Authority of *Oecumenical* and *Patriarchal* Councils? Why not in these also one Ecclesiastical major Party judge another, as well as in that of *Dort*? *Credo unam, Catholicam, Ecclesiam:* How this Church *One*, if united in no one common Government and Subjection? But, if it be: here also one party must judge another; and so the *Protestants* alledging the Council of *Trent* an adverse *Party*, avails them nothing, as to the *annulling* of its *Judgment*. But, as the *Remonstrants*, yet further replied † If, at least, of the *Clergy* living under the same Secular Government, one adverse Party may judge the other, then may a Synod of the *Catholick Clergy* in *France* oblige the *Protestant Clergy* there to stand to their sentence: To this, therefore, the Synod shapes another answer, as me seems no better, than the former: That all *Protestants* are freed from being tried or judged by the *Popish* party in Synods: For That —— † *Primi Ecclesiæ Reformatores pro Doctoribus Ecclesiæ Pontificiæ haberi noluerunt, sed contra ab iis secessionem fecerunt.* Again, *Ibid.* —— *Isti nunquam Ecclesiæ Pontificiæ Doctores censeri voluerunt, sicuti Hi* [*i. e.* the *Remonstrants*] *pro Ecclesiæ Reformatæ Doctoribus haberi cupiunt.* So also the *Geneva Divines*, *Sess.* 29. deliver their judgment, —— *Licuit* (say they) *nostris protestari adversus Concilium Constantiense, & Tridentinum: quia non profitemur unionem cum illis: Imo illam aspernamur, & aversamur.* But, I say, doth our *renouncing*, and professing to have no *communion* with a lawful, *Superiour Ecclesiastical Authority* presently, in justice, free us from it? For example, the Presbyter *Arius* his renouncing communion with the *Bishop* of *Alexandria*? or the Presbyter *Luther*, with his *Ecclesiastical Superiours* in *Saxony*? Is there not a due subordination both of Persons and Synods, from the lowest to the highest, as well in *several*, as in the *same* secular Governments, to preserve the unity of the *Church*, not only *Belgick*, or *Britannick*, but *Catholick*? Which gradual Authority

† See *Synod. Delf. Sess.* 26.

Conc. Delf. in Acta Dordrecht, Sess. 6.

rity all those are obliged to obey, and conform to, and are liable to its censures; not who voluntarily profess obedience, but who truly, according to the Church's Canons, do owe it; as the *Protestants* did to that of *Trent*, and owe it not a whit the less for their declaring against it: Else so many as will venture to be *schismaticks*, and divide, will put themselves out of the reach of the Church's Spiritual Courts; And, had the Remonstrants, to their supposed innovation in doctrine, added a separation in communion from the rest of the *Belgick* Clergy, the *Contra-Remonstrants*, they had, by this second fault, freed themselves from having been either justly tried or censured by the Synod: and their declaring once, —— *Non profitemur unionem cum vobis: imo illam aspernamur, & aversamur*, would have voided all the counter-actings of the *Synod* of *Dort*; as these *Dort-Divines* say, the *Reformed's* like Protestation did, those of *Trent*.

To *μ*. See what is said, §. 125. *Leo* the Tenth did no wrong in declaring the *Protestant*-tenents Heresies, if several of them were condemned by several allowed Councils, ‖ and consequently the maintainers of them, were *Hereticks*: Yet is it usual for Councils, and other Courts of Judicature, to *reiterate* their *sentence* so often, as offenders reiterate the same faults, or revive the same errors: And therefore was this done in *Trent*.

§. 255. —— To *μ*. —— ‖ See §. 198.

T *ν*. See §. 83, 92. The *place* of the *Council* was chosen by the consent of most Christian Princes: no place could be appointed of an equal convenience for all Countries: the place was under the *Emperor*'s power, as himself often declared; not accessible by the *Pope*'s forces; and secure enough to the *main* Body of *Protestants*, those of *Germany*; from which *place* also their forces, when time was, frighted the Council: Lastly, nearer to them than to the *Catholicks* of *Spain*, and *France*. A *safe-conduct* also the *Protestants* had, as large, as could justly be desired; and the *Exceptions* they took against it, were unreasonable. Of which see before, §. 104. The Council of *Constance* is also much wronged, and the proceedings thereof against *Jo. Huß* misrelated: Of which see before, §. 101. The *Divines* also that, upon the *Safe-conduct*, came to the Council of *Trent*, were courteously treated, and dismissed; though the designs of those Princes, that sent them thither, were treacherous, and bloody. †

§. 256. —— To *ν*. ——

†. §. 68, 90.

To *ξ*. The whole abode of the *Protestant Divines* of *Trent*, from their first coming to their departure, was but in all about a *Fortnights* time; after which short time the *Protestant Princes*, unexpectedly, appeared in *Arms*. Though it is true also, that at their coming one of the Legats his accidentally falling sick of a disease, of which he died within a few weeks, somewhat retarded the business of treating with them; the manner of which Treaty required much deliberation. Lastly, by their *printing* the *defence* of their tenents, the Fathers of the Council heard sufficiently what they could say; yet were no way *swayed* with their *Arguments*.

§. 257. —— To *ξ*. ——

To *π*. See §. 68. *n*. 2. and what is said before to *λ*. To refer the judgment of *Spiritual* matters to *Lay-persons*, as more indifferent; or to change the former ordinary Ecclesiastical *Judges* of such Controversies, because these are fore-known to be of a *contrary* opinion to those, who are to appear

§. 258. —— To *π*. ——

before their Tribunal is shewed before, §. 254. to be a most unreasonable demand. Neither, if such thing had been granted, could it have advantaged the *Protestants:* For, whether their Judge had been the *whole*, and not only the Episcopal, *Clergy*, or *Secular Princes*, or *People*; a *major* part of all these, they knew, to be *Catholick*, and of a belief opposite to theirs. † And, whom their writings had hitherto not changed, or perswaded, why should they think their discourse, or disputes would? Lastly, an *equal* number on both sides, without any umpirage, appointed to be their Judges, is a *Court*, that, where either party is resolute, can proceed to no sentence. They, who foresee a major part of those, to whom our Lord hath committed the Government, and guidance of his Church, opposing their Doctrine, are already self-condemned, as to Authority; and ought not to *seek* a *new Judge*, but *reform* their *errors*.

† See before §. 115. *n.* 2. §. 118, *&c.*

§. 259. To †. See what is said, §. 105. To shew, that this *Oath* was not given in any prejudice to the freedom of the Council; for 1st. It was not only an Oath used at *Ordinations*, not new framed for, or imposed on, the Council at *Trent*. It, or the like was *anciently* taken by the *Bishops* when ordained, without being thought prejudicial to the *liberty* of *former Councils*. 2. Again, an Oath it was only obliging to a legal obedience due by the Divine, or Church-laws (an Oath to this purpose being taken also by *Protestant* Bishops;) and so, strengthning only that engagement of Bishops to the observance of these laws, which they had before, when yet unsworn. So that, notwithstanding such Oath, they might question any *Papal pretended* right, which they thought not *Canonical:* As also it is clear they freely did, without any thought, or jealousie, of their trespassing against this Oath, and without the *Pope*'s Legats objecting it to them. 3. Again; neither did such Oath, in such a sence, restrain them to observance of the *Canons*; as that now, when in a conjunct Body, and the *See Apostolick* concurring, they might not also abrogate, and change the same Canons, as thought fit. 4. However; An Oath it was laying no *restraint* upon the *Council*'s *liberty*, as to voting any way concerning most of the *Protestant Controversies:* unless perhaps that of the *Pope*'s *Supremacy*. 5. Again, If this Oath binding them to any thing thought unlawful, their learning well enough knew, they were, without any *Dispensation*, obliged to break, not keep, it; and that in an unlawful engagement, every one is free from it, as soon as he knows it such. 6. Lastly, this Oath being taken generally by all, how come the *French*, and *Spanish* Bishops, to be said to have acted so diversly from the *Italian* Bishops, if *all* were so straightly tied, by the *same Oath*, to the *Pope*'s interest.

To †. It, or the like was *anciently* taken by the *Bishops* when ordained, without being thought prejudicial to the *liberty* of *former Councils*.

As for what is said, —— *That none had suffrage in this Council, but such as were professt enemies to all, that called for Reformation, or a free Council:* Here, since it cannot be denied; that all the *Bishops*, present in *Trent*, had *Suffrages*, none excluded, it is by the Objectors confessed, that not only the Major part, but the *whole* Council of *Trent*, was an enemy to the *Reformation*; and the *Pope*, as to all those Points, that proceeded singly against them, secure enough of a *full* vote, without the multiplying of *Italian*, or *Titular*, or *Pensionary*, Bishops.

To

To σ. 1. See, §. 160. The *propoſal* of the *Legats* could alter nothing in the Council's votes, as to the things that were propoſed; eſpecially as to thoſe *Proteſtant* Controverſies, wherein they unanimouſly agreed; but only could hinder ſome things from being *voted*, becauſe not *propoſed*: But no *Proteſtant* Controverſies are found ſo omitted. Again, ſuch Propoſal ſeems very neceſſary for *order* ſake; nor was any way uſed by the Legats to abridge the deſires of any conſiderable part of the Council concerning any Proponends, as is amply ſhewed, See §. 164. §. 160. §. 260. To σ. 1.

To σ. 2. See §. 164. Things were firſt conſulted on, and voted in *Trent*, not at *Rome*; the *Pope* uſually advertiſed of their Conſultations, after the judgment of the *Congregations* already paſſed, returned *Inſtructions* to his Legats, before the *General Seſſions*, concerning his opinion of the matter in hand; and commendable had it been, and advantageous to the Synod, could the *Biſhops*, or *Metropolitans* of each *Province* have done the like to their Repreſentatives. *Celeſtine*, and *Leo* declared their judgements to the third and fourth General Council, not to give a law to them, but advice. If the *Pope*'s *Inſtructions* to his Legats, concerning any Points to be handled in Council, were lawful *before* the Council, why not *during* it? Eſpecially the matters being ſo various, as that the *Legats* were not capable of ſuch Inſtructions all at once; neither did this encroach on the *liberty* of the Council: unleſs it can be ſhewed, that the Council was obliged to *follow* it; which, it is clear, they were not, becauſe, *de facto*, they many times oppoſed it. Neither was any thing in matter of Doctrine voted in Council, whatever inſtructions came in the male from *Rome*, a conſiderable part *reſiſting*. §. 261. To σ. 2.

To τ. See what is ſaid, §. 170, 171. The *Pope*'s *Penſions* given to ſome poorer Biſhops, during ſo long a Seſſion of the Council, might be an effect of his *charity*, not *policy*. However, it is clear, that their aſſiſtance to him was uſeleſs as to *Proteſtant* Controverſies; and ſtood him in little ſtead, as to thoſe *Catholick* ones, wherein a conſiderable part of the Council oppoſed him; none of which were paſſed for him; if any perhaps were hindred by his party from being paſſed againſt him; this was the uttermoſt of any ſervice, done by his Penſioners. As for many *Titular Biſhops* ſent, and *new* Biſhopricks erected, during the Council, whilſt thoſe things are only in general ſaid, and no particulars named, they carry the ſuſpicion of a groundleſs report. §. 262. To τ.

To υ. The Council's determining things *repugnant* to *Scripture*. 1. That no injunction *repugnant* to the *Holy Scriptures* is to be obeyed, is on all ſides agreed on: But, that ſome of the Council's decrees are contrary to the Scriptures, as it is a thing affirmed by the *Proteſtants*, the leſſer; ſo is it denied by the *Council*, and its *adherents*, much the major part of the Doctors and Church-Governors of the *Weſt*. We are to ſeek then, which of them, our *duty* doth oblige us to *obey*, and follow. §. 263. To υ.

Next, 2. As to the Council's determining things *not warranted by Scripture*, See before, §. 176. the two Propoſitions (both Divine Revelation) whereby the Scriptures warrant the Church, in her defining, and requiring a belief of, ſuch things to be *lawful*, and in her injoining ſuch things to be *practiſed*, as the Holy Scriptures have not *prohibited*, or declared againſt. This

warrant from the Scriptures, for any of their Decrees, the *Council* wants not: and affirms no further warrant from them, as to such Decrees, necessary.

§. 264. To 9. I answer. 1st. That the Council of *Trent* allows no *Tradition, extra Scripturas*, or unwritten there, to be sufficient ground of defining matter of faith, unless it be Tradition *Apostolical*. —— *Traditiones* (saith It) † *quæ ex ipsius Christi ore ab Apostolis acceptæ, aut ab ipsis Apostolis, Spiritu Sancto dictante, quasi per manus traditæ ad nos usque pervenerunt.* —— And ‖ —— *Vult S. Synodus quod causæ controversæ secundum sacram Scripturam, & Apostolorum Traditiones, &c. in prædicto Concilio tractentur.*

To 9.

† See *Sess.* 4. *Decret. de Canon Scrip.*

‖ *Salv. Conduct. Sess.* 15.

2ly. That any Council should make the *word of God* delivered by the Apostles either by Tradition written (the Holy Scriptures) or unwritten (*i. e.* by them,) *equally* a ground of Faith, where there is a certainty, equal, or sufficient, of the *one*, as of the *other*, that it is *Apostolical*, I see not, how it can be liable to any Censure. —— Of this thus Mr. *Stillingfleet*, † —— *Your next inquiry is to this sense: Whether Apostolical Tradition be not then as credible, as the Scriptures? I answer freely: (supposing it equally evident,) what was delivered by the Apostles to the Church by word, or writing, hath equal Credibility.* [As for the *necessity* of *standing Records*, which he there alledgeth, from the speedy decay of an *Oral Tradition*; this is sufficiently remedied, if the Apostles Successors at least do commit to writing things which were by them orally received]. And thus Mr. *Chillingworth*, † —— *We conceive no antipathy between God's Word written, and unwritten, but that both might stand very well together,* —— *If God had pleased, he might so have disposed it, that part might have been written, and part unwritten: but then he would have taken order, to whom we should have had recourse for that part of it, which was not written.* [So he hath, sending us to our Spiritual Guides, † who do, by Tradition of their Predecessors writings, convey to us that right sence of Scriptures, which is dubious in the written letter of them.] 3ly. None can rationally deny, that the *Traditive* Doctrine of the *Church-Guides* would have been a *sufficient* ground of our *faith*, had the *Scriptures* not been written, because it was so, before they were written; and is still to some, who cannot read them written; or know, that others read them right. Of this also thus Mr. *Stillingfleet*, † —— *It is evident from the nature of the thing, that the writing of a divine Revelation is not necessary for the ground, and reason of faith, as to that revelation: Because men may believe a Divine Revelation without it; as is not only evident in the case of the Patriarchs, but of all those, who in the time of Christ, and his Apostles, did believe the truth of the Doctrine of Christ, before it was written,* —— *and this is still the case of all illiterate persons, who cannot resolve their faith properly into the Scripture, but into the Doctrine delivered them out of the Scripture.* 4ly. We find the first General Councils, universally allowed, to have grounded their Decrees upon the Argument of *Tradition*, and the Doctrine, or *Interpretation*, of *Scriptures*, descended to them from former ages, as well as upon the *Text* of Scriptures; and by both these, not one of them singly, to have defended their cause against *Heretics*. Of which thus *Athanasius*. † —— *Ecce nos demonstramus istiusmodi sententiam a Patribus ad Patres, quasi per manus, traditam esse,* —— and, —— *In eo Concilio illa sunt scripta, quæ ab initio ipsi, qui Testes oculati,*

† P. 210.

† *Heb.* 13. 7, 17. — *Eph.* 4. 11, 14.

† P. 208.

† *Synodi Nicen. Decreta.*

oculati, & Miniſtri verbi fuere, tradiderunt. Fides enim quæ ſcriptis, decretiſque Synodi ſancita eſt, ea eſt totius Eccleſiæ. And, ‖ —— *Ego arbitrabar omnium (quotquot unquam fuere) hæreticorum inanem garrulitatem, Nicæno Concilio ſedatam eſſe. Nam fides, quæ inibi a Patribus, ſecundum ſacras Scripturas, tradita, & confeſſionibus confirmata eſt, ſatis mihi idonea, efficaxque videbatur ad omnem impietatem evertendam, & pietatem ejus, quæ in Chriſto eſt, fidei conſtituendam.* ‖ *Epiſtol. ad Epictetum.*

5ly. *Proteſtants*, in ſome point of faith, ground their belief only, or at leaſt ſufficiently, on Tradition † namely in this: *That the Scriptures are God's Word*; and conſequently muſt allow any other Tradition of *equal* evidence a ſufficient ground of any other *Article* of *Faith*; and ſo do, —— *When you can produce* (ſaith Mr. *Stillingfleet.* ‖) *as certain evidence of any Apoſtolical Tradition diſtinct from Scripture, as we can do, that the Books of Scripture were delivered by the Apoſtles to the Church, you may then be hearkned to.* And Mr. *Chillingworth*, † —— *Prove your whole Doctrine by ſuch a Tradition* [as that by which the Scripture is proved to be God's Word] *and we will yeild to you in all things.* † *Stillingfl. pt. 1. c. 7.* ‖ *P. 210.* † *P. 73.*

6ly. Tradition, unwritten in Scripture, is either a delivery of ſomething *not contained* in Scripture, or the expoſition, or delivery of the *true ſenſe* of what is contained there: The latter ſort of which Traditions the Church much more makes uſe of, and vindicates, than the former (ſee *Diſc.* 2. §. 40. *n.* 2.) Again, both theſe Traditions are either only *oral*, (in which is the leſs certainty,) or alſo committed to *writing* by the Apoſtles Succeſſors. Now an *unanimous Tradition* of the *ſence* of Scriptures found in the *writings* of the *Fathers*, is alſo often pretended to be made uſe of by *Proteſtants*, as the ground of their *faith*, where the ſence of Scripture is in diſpute. For, if we ask them, whether the letter of Scripture only, or the ſence, is that which they believe, and call *God's Word*, or Divine Revelation; they anſwer, that they believe the *ſence* of it to be ſo: If asked again, in Scriptures of dubious interpretation, why they believe *this* to be the ſence, not *another*; they anſwer, becauſe this by Primitive Tradition is delivered to be the ſence of it; which Tradition, ſo *early*, ſo *univerſal*, &c. they believe to have deſcended from the *Apoſtles*. 7ly. Concerning what Traditions have the Evidence of *Apoſtolical* (as *Proteſtants* grant ſome have) what not, I know no other authorized, or alſo fitter, *Judge*, than the *Council*; nor any other way, that the *Church* can deliver her Judgment in them, than by her *Councils*. And, if Councils are to judge, what Traditions are ſuch, the ſame Councils may proceed, where they find theſe clear, to ground their *decrees* on them, as ſuch. This is ſaid to ſhew: that *Traditions*, if evidently *Apoſtolical*, are a *ſufficient* ground of faith; that ſome Traditions are granted to be *evidently* ſo; and, that private Chriſtians depend on the *Church*'s Judgment, which are ſo: That ancient allowed Councils have uſed the Argument of *Tradition*, as well as of *Scripture*, to prove the verity of their *Definitions*; and for theſe reaſons, the Council of *Trent* † ſeems not culpable, if uſing the ſame as a ground for her defining Controverſies, *de fide*. 8. But, 8ly. I know no *definition* of the Council of *Trent* in any matter of faith, that is oppoſed by *Proteſtants*, which is not pretended to be grounded on the *Divine Scriptures*. On theſe *Scriptures*, either, if it be in ſpeculative points of faith, *revealing* it; Or, if in matter of

† *Seſſ.* 4.

of practice, either *commanding*, or *not prohibiting* it: This latter being enough for an obliging of that assent, or belief, which the Council requires, *viz.* that the thing, not so prohibited, is *lawful*. 9ly. Lastly, wherever the *Protestants*, for the points in Controversie, press the Council of *Trent*'s defining them from pretended Tradition, not only *extra*, but, *contra, Scripturam* [speaking of the true sence thereof] the *Catholicks* freely join with them; that, where any Tradition is not said, but proved contrary to Scripture (*i. e.* the pretended Apostolick *unwritten* Tradition contrary to the *written*) such *unwritten* Tradition is to be rejected, the other followed.

§. 265. To χ. That nothing, as matter of *faith*, was defined by the Council of *Trent*, which hath not descended from, and is not warranted by, *Apostolical* Tradition, is as constantly affirmed by *Catholicks*, as denied by *Protestants*. That nothing is maintained by the Council as *Apostolical Tradition*, that is repugnant to what is unanimously delivered in the *writings* of the first 300 years, is also asserted by *Catholicks*, as the contrary is pretended by *Protestants*. But that nothing is, or may be pretended *Apostolical Tradition*, but what can be shewed unanimously delivered in the foresaid *writings* (as if all that descended to posterity must needs be, in them, so *few*, so *short*, set down, and registred) this as *Protestants* alledge it a *just*, so *Catholicks* hold it *too short* a, measure, by which to examine Traditions *Apostolical*. This, for *matters* of *faith*; as for other things decreed, or enjoined by the Council to be practised; and so consequently, this to be believed of them, that the *practice* thereof is *lawful*; it is not necessary, that such things be warranted by *Apostolical* Tradition, but only, that they cannot be shewed repugnant to it.

To χ.

§. 266. To ϛ. See what hath been shewed at large in satisfaction to this great complaint, from §. 173. to §. 203. Where is shewed; that the *Lutheran*'s many erroneous opinions in matter of faith engaged the Council to so many contrary definitions; and that it is no wonder, if the Decrees of this Council were a summ of former Church Doctrine, and Tradition; as *Lutheranism* was a Complex of former errors (and probably, the *last*, and *greatest* attempt, that shall be made against the *Catholick* Faith.) and that, for the Council's making so many Anathema's, it is only their blame, who have broached, or revived so many dangerous Tenents. That this Council hath inserted no *new Article* into the former *Creeds*; though no just cause can be alledged, why this Council (only, if supposed a *General* one) might not have done so, had they thought fit. 1. no former *Canon* of any Council (not that of *Ephesus*, See §. 77.) having *prohibited* such a thing. 2. No former *Canon*, that prohibits such a thing, being *valid*, or justly *prescribing* to a succeeding Council of *equal* authority. That for its making new Definitions in matters of Faith; and for its requiring assent to, or belief of, them under *Anathema*, or *Excommunication*, it is, if a crime, a common one to it with all other former *allowed Councils*, even the four first: and that the *Protestants*, accusing this Council thereof, yet do the same thing in their own. That this Council requires not, from all persons, an explicit knowledge and belief of, or assent to, all these their *Definitions* under pain of losing *Salvation*; where an ignorance of them is without *contempt* of the Church's Authority, and where the persons, after knowing them,

To ϛ.

them, do not persist obstinately to contradict, or refuse to submit their judgment, and give credit to them, as the Decisions of a *Judge*, authorized by our Lord to determine such *Controversies*, and ever preserved infallible in all *Necessaries*. Lastly. That, in the beginning of the Council, *two* wayes being proposed, as *Soave* relates, † the one, *to condemn the* Lutheran *Heresie in general, and their* Books; *only singling out some chief Article thereof, to be Anathematized*; the other, —— *To bring under examination all the propositions of the* Lutheran *Doctrine capable of a bad construction; and out of these to censure and condemn that, which, after mature Deliberation, should seem necessary and convenient, with much reason the Council seems to have taken the latter of these, though much more tedious and painful*, for the greater benefit both of those within, and those without, the Church's Communion; that her *children* might more exactly know all those *noxious* Tenents they were to avoid, and her *adversaries* those they were to reform. And if, in taking this second way, the *Council* escaped not obloquy, yet much more had they incurred it in taking the *first*, *i. e.* in condemning so many Persons and their Writings for many Corruptions of *Catholick* Truths, and then naming none, or a few; and not using so much care in sifting the Novelties of *Luther*, who drew such a train after him, as their Predecessors at *Constance* did, in those of *Jo. Wicliff.* or *Jo. Huss.* † *P.* 192.

Neither, in so *particular* a Discussion and Censure of the *Lutheran* Doctrines, is this Council destitute of the *Example* of many former *Councils*, very copious in their *Anathema's* against Heresies of a much less latitude, and in some matters, as considered in themselves, seeming of no great Malignity. For which; see no less than *twelve* Anathema's of the third *General* Council passed against *Nestorius*, according to the several Particulars, whereinto his *Error* had branched it self, and colours, he had laid upon it, though all pointing at one thing; *two persons in our Lord Christ* (a thing *Soave* saith, || the Council of *Trent* took notice of, and set before them as a Pattern:) See the 25 *Anathema's* of the *Syrmian* Council, all relating to several branches of *Photinianisme*: The *eight* Anathematisms of the *Milevitan* Council pursuing all the *particular* points of *Pelagianisme*. The *eleven* Anathemas of the second *Nicene* Council, † all about *Veneration* of *Images*: The twenty Anathematisms of that ancient Council at *Gangra*, A. D. 319. (wherein the famous *Hosius* was present) pronounced against the *Eustathians*, letting nothing, how small soever it might seem to be, in this their censure pass unbranded, wherein this Sect was found to oppose the *Church's* common Doctrine, and Practice. Many of which *Anathema's* of *former* Councils, if you please to compare with those of *Trent*, you shall find several of them, as to the *Gravity* of the matter, much inferior: Lastly, see the late *Council* at *Constance* condemning not only 45 propositions, of *John Wicliff* recited there, † but 260 more, besides; of the same temper: All which had been formerly with much care, by the *University* of *Oxford*, gleaned out of his writings: they bringing under their censure not only such *Articles*, as were *Blasphemi*, *Hæretici*, or *Seditiosi*, but also, as were *temerarii*, *scandalosi*, or *piarum aurium offensivi*, and letting none escape them, that might do hurt. In the same Council also afterward † were no less than 30 propositions of *John Huss* condemned. Now, we may presume, §. 267. || *P.* 192. † *Act* 7. † *Sess.* 8. † *Sess.* 15.

ſume, that *Luther*, and his Followers, to thoſe who put their ſickle into their books, to bring to trial what ſeemed faults, could not but yeild an harveſt much more fertile; Nor was the care here to be leſs, where the danger was much greater. And, for this ſtrict Inquiſition, and ſearch made by Councils, we owe great thanks to the providence of God. For thus, whilſt the wantonneſs and curioſity of mens underſtanding, from the *Faith* delivered in *General* ſtill deſcends to things more *particular*; and ſo, raiſeth new Diſputes in the Church, and ſpreads falſe opinions, the contrary Determinations of Councils (regulated by *neceſſary Conſequences*) render alſo the *Chriſtian Faith* from time to time more *particular*, and ſo, more exact, and leſs liable to be corrupted; when all that (in queſtion) comes to be *ſtated*, that is clearly evidenced, and the knowledge thereof, any way uſeful. So, ſince the ſetling, by Council, of thoſe *particular* points contained in the *Athanaſian* Creed, explicating that of the *Apoſtles* much more ſhort, and General; the Church, as to *theſe* points, hath enjoyed a great repoſe, and freedom from thoſe diſputes, with which ſome ages of it before were miſerably diſtracted. And, if the *Decrees* of the Council of *Trent* have had the ſame effect (as *Soave* † *P.* 1, 2. complains they have, in the beginning of his Hiſtory †) the *Proteſtants* may impute it to their precedent queſtioning of the Church's Doctrine, and diſturbance of her peace.

§. 268. To *ω*. See what is ſaid before, §. 244. *Bene facere, male audire*, is the common fortune of *Governors*, and to the cenſorious and male-contents the world

To *ω*. is ſtill out of *order* (though God himſelf governs it,) and the *worſt* times are always the *preſent*. Whether the *Trent-Decrees* for *Reformation*, which were never ſo numerous in any Council, and deſign'd from the beginning of it to have an half ſhare, with points of Doctrine, in all their Conſultations, and in the compoſition of which ſo many ſeveral Parties, well ſeen at leaſt in one anothers Defects, concurred, were ſo contrived as to remove *motes*, and not *beams*, to cure *itches*, not *feavers*; I muſt refer you to the re-conſideration of the particulars ſet down before, from §. 112. Neither may we think, that it was the medling with *motes*, that offended ſo much, either the Court of *Rome*, or of *France*, as *Soave* tells us their Reformation did. For any *defects*, ſtill ſeen in Church-Government, Diſcipline, *&c.* (which always are, and will be, many) it ought not to be charged on theſe laws, but the non-execution of them; which neglect alſo uſeth to be much more in thoſe *laws*, that are more *exact*, and *perfect*, and ſo more contrary to common practice. But, ſince the ſitting of this Council, there have not wanted thoſe pious Biſhops (as S. *Carlo Borremeo*, and others) who molding their *Reformations* exactly according to theſe *Decrees*, have manifeſted to the world the great perfection thereof.

§. 269. To *α α*. See what hath been ſaid in Defence of this *Diſpenſative Power* placed in the *Supreme Eccleſiaſtical* Governor, before, §. 216. 1. The Coun-

To *α α*. cil, weighing the conveniences thereof with the inconveniences, yet declared, † —— *Publice expedit, legis vinculum quandoque relaxare, ut plenius, eveni-*

† *Seſſ.* 25. *De Reform. Gen. c.* 18. *entibus caſibus, & neceſſitatibus, pro communi utilitate ſatisfiat.* Elſe, the laws may ſometimes hurt, where they ſhould help. 2. Again, this Diſpenſative Power,

Power, depoſed in this Eccleſiaſtical Supreme, is no new uſurpation, but an ancient priviledge enjoyed always by him: Of which ſee before, §. 217. 3. Next: It had here ſome qualifications, and clogs laid upon it by the Council: As; † that ſuch *Diſpenſation* ſhall be accounted *ſurreptitious* and void, when not given *gratis*, and *cauſa prius cognita*; the *Ordinary* being conſtituted the *Inſpector* and Examiner of this. † Now he muſt be very perverſly wicked, who will iſſue forth ſuch a *Diſpenſation*, where he neither receives *benefit* by it, nor ſees *juſt cauſe* for it. 4. Laſtly. The ſame Diſpenſative Power, as to the *civil* Laws, is repoſed in the *Secular Supreme*; neither is the vigor of ſuch Laws eſteemed to be overthrown by it.

† See before §. 215.

† *Seſſ.* 25. *c.* 18.

To ββ. See before (§. 204.) the contrary declared by *Soave*. To ββ.

This briefly, here, to the *Proteſtant Objections*, the ſatisfaction of which hath been more largely proſecuted through the whole Body of the former Diſcourſe.

And thus, through many obſtacles, I have at length finiſhed my Deſign, the Vindication of a *Council*, which, once admitted, hath paſſed a peremptory ſentence againſt the new pretended *Reformation*, and determined all the chiefeſt modern *Controverſies*.

CHAP. XIV.

Of the pretence of following Conſcience, againſt Church-Authority.

Two Defences againſt obeying, or yielding Aſſent to, Church-Authority, §. 271.
1. *The Neceſſity of following our Conſcience.*
2. *The Certainty of a Truth, that is oppoſed by the Church.*

Reply to the firſt,

That following our Conſcience, when miſinformed, excuſeth not from fault, §. 272.

Three ways, whereby the Will uſually corrupts the Judgment or Conſcience, and miſleads it, as it pleaſeth, in matters of Religion.

1. *Diverting the intellect to other employments, and not permitting it at all to ſtudy and examine, matters of Religion*, §. 274.
2. *Permitting an enquiry or ſearch into matters of Religion: but this not impartial, and univerſal*, §. 275.
3. *Admitting a free, and univerſal, ſearch, as to other points controverted in Religion, but not as to Church-Authority*, §. 277.

Where,

That the Judgment may, and often doth, oblige men to go againſt their own Opinion, and ſeeming Reaſon, §. 278.

§. 270. After all this pains taken for eſtabliſhing the *Legal Authority* of this *Council*, ſome perhaps will wiſh this labour had been rather ſpent in a confirmation, by ſolid and evident arguments, of the *Truth* of its particular *Decrees*: becauſe, though we have our end, and though this Council ſhould be granted juſtly to claim all that obedience, which will be confeſſed due to the *moſt ſupreme* Church-Authority; Yet this moſt Supreme Church-Authority is denied by *Proteſtants* rightly to challenge *obedience* from its Subjects, eſpecially that of *aſſent*, in ſeveral caſes: Whereof two are much urged, and ſo ſeem neceſſary here to be a little more exactly conſidered, before I diſmiſs the Reader, that the precedent Diſcourſe may not be fruſtrated, by ſuch pretences, of its deſired effect.

§. 271. The firſt *Guard*, that is uſed againſt obedience to ſuch *Authority*, is this. That none can be juſtly obliged to obey any humane Authority, ſo, as to go againſt his conſcience, or profeſs any thing truth, which he thinks error. For, though ſuch perſon err in thinking ſuch thing an error, yet muſt ſuch an erroneous *conſcience*, and not ſuch Authority, in this caſe, be followed, and obeyed.

The

The ſecond is: That, at leaſt, none are obliged to obey the Definitions, or Judgment, of a legal Church-Authority, where ſuch are, not only *perſwaded* in *conſcience*, but *demonſtratively certain* (as ſome affirm they are) of the contrary to its Definition; and that, therein, it manifeſtly erreth.

Theſe two, then, ſhall be conſidered in their order. And to the firſt of them, I return this. 1. That, where Conſcience, or Judgment (for theſe are both one) propoſeth any thing for truth, yet not without ſome *doubt*, and *fear* of the contrary, here the Will, or the Perſon, ought to ſuſpend action, and put the Judgment firſt on a further ſearch. 2ly. That, where ſuch *fear* is not, the Judgment (erring, or not erring) is indeed to be obeyed: becauſe the perſon always ſuppoſeth this, not to err, but to propoſe what is right, ſince he hath no way to know when it errs, but by it ſelf: And it alſo can never err *knowingly*, or *willingly*. 3ly. Yet: That in the action, wherein he followeth it when erring, he may much offend God; and this more or leſs, according to the quality of the error, namely, where the Judgment, or Conſcience, doth not invincibly, but culpably, err; and hath means of being better informed, and ſo of diſcovering its error. So the Jews, when killing our Lord and his Apoſtles, moſt grievouſly offended God, in following an erroneous Judgment, or Conſcience dictating to them, that they *did God good ſervice* herein. And indeed it is a great art of the Devil, as much as he can, to put out the eye of the Judgment, to make men act more reſolutely, where Conſcience leads them on; he finding, that the zeal of Ignorance doth him far more ſervice, than a timorous hypocriſie, and diſſembling againſt Conſcience, could ever do. §. 272.

Now here you ſee; our freedom from Guilt, in not ſubmitting to Authority, is devolved wholy on this, our care, that this our diſſenting Conſcience, or Judgment, be rightly informed; ſeeing our non-obedience finds not the leaſt patronage, or excuſe, from a Conſcience culpably erring. And with this care of well-informing the Judgment or Conſcience, it is the *Will*, that is intruſted; though the Underſtanding doth the work. For we muſt know; that, though the Underſtanding, in its *aſſents*, or *diſſents*, acts neceſſarily; and cannot but know, and believe, what it knows, and believes: and doth generally in all acts follow the evidence of its *object* (ſo far as it appears,) not the command of the *will:* And, therefore, Secondly, as to thoſe Principles that are *per ſe nota*, and ſelf-evident [as; *That every whole is bigger than a part: The ſame thing cannot be, and not be. Equals taken from Equals, the Remains will be equal: Good is to be followed, Evil avoided,*] the Judgment cannot ſuffer the leaſt corruption, or alteration from the Will: Whence it is, that, as to ſuch Principles, all men, how differently ſoever engaged in the affections, do fully conſent, and agree. Yet, as for other propoſitions, the truth of which is not diſcerned from any ſelf-evidence, but learn'd by proofs and arguments drawn from ſome other things better known, here the truth of ſuch propoſition cannot be attained, but by the induſtry and application of the intellect to the ſtudy, and diſcovery of §. 273.

ſuch proofs; and again, ſuch application of the intellect to one thing, or another, for a little, or a long time, depends wholy on the Will. And thus come our opinions and tenents to be ſubjected to our Will, and ſhe again is ſo, commonly, to our ſecular intereſts. And ſhe, thus, by applying the Intellect, or Judgment, to what things, and how far ſhe thinks fit, makes in it what impreſſions ſhe pleaſeth: And then, after all this, excuſeth her ſelf, that ſhe is led by it; that it is appointed her Maſter, and Director; that it always neceſſarily aſſents to what appears truth to it, and that ſhe regularly practiſeth, and lives according to, its dictates. And ſhe corrupts it, in thoſe who deny obedience, in ſpiritual matters, to that Eccleſiaſtical Authority to which it is due, commonly by one of theſe three ways following. Which charity towards thoſe, who are frequently thus deceived, obligeth me here firſt to ſet down more particularly; and then, to conſider ſome Remedies thereof.

§. 274. The *Will*, then, is wont to abuſe the *Judgment*, or *Conſcience*. 1. Either firſt, by keeping it in much *ignorance*, as to thoſe things wherein more knowledge may happen to be prejudicial to her, and check her contents; Applying it rather to Secular Affairs, or Humane Literature, and cautiouſly waving the conſideration of matters of *Religion*, and keeping it a ſtranger from all ſuch Debates; that ſo, when it is ſummoned, by its local Superiors, to a profeſſion thereof, it may ſoon reſolve it ſelf out of that ſtock, which in our former Education it hath received from our Parents, or other Inſtructors: and may always, without ſcruples, move with the common ſtream, where we live, and whereon depend our fortunes: Or alſo, may readily become of any other perſwaſion, if a different intereſt calls for it: whilſt it is ſolidly founded in none, nor hath any deep counter-impreſſion to any ſide; but keeps the Judgment, as to theſe matters of the greateſt concernment, in an indifferent, tepid, lazy, luke-warm ſloth, moſt pernicious to ſo many, as are not, by God's merciful providence, ranged under the Guidance of a juſt Church-Authority. And, ſuch perſons, ordinarily, quiet themſelves with that perſwaſion of ſome of the *Donatiſts* mentioned by S. *Auſtin*, † —— *Nihil intereſſe credentes, in qua parte quis Chriſtianus ſit; & ideo permanebunt in ea parte, in qua nati ſunt.* Or elſe think, at leaſt, by their voluntary winking, that they ſhall be excuſed, if they, after this, ſtumble, and miſs their way. —— *Tria ſunt* (ſaith this Father †) *hominum genera, profecto improbanda ac deteſtanda: Unum eorum, qui neque ſe ſcire exiſtimant, nec quærere volunt. Alterum eorum, qui ſentiunt quidem ſe neſcire, ſed non ita quærunt; ut invenire poſſint. Tertium eorum, qui ſe arbitrantur ſcire, quod neſciunt.* Theſe then ſeem to be of the firſt ſort. *Qui neque ſe ſcire exiſtimant, nec quærere volunt.* This is the firſt Deceit.

† *Epiſt.* 48.

† *De utilitate Credendi, c.* 11.

§. 275. 2. But, If the *Will*, (more piouſly inclined) thinks fit to apply it ſelf to the conſidering of matters of *Religion* (as which, ſurely, moſt concern all men, as to their Salvation, and Eternity.) 2ly. It hath another way ſtill of corrupting the *Judgment*, * by permitting it only to be acquainted with ſuch Authors, or Directors, in theſe matters, as are of its party, and conſpire with its intereſts; and * by moſt carefully with-holding it from ſuch others, as write, or teach contrary; unleſs it be only ſo much of them, as its own

Authors

Authors take in hand to confute. Which Authors, though they usually relate both sides of the Controversie, and explain their Adversaries Tenents, as well as their own, (and so the Reader conceits himself impartial enough, in his receiving information of both parties;) yet seldom do they, I mean, those, who have not only an Adversary, but the Truth, against them (for those Writers, who have truth on their side, need no such arts) seldom, I say, do they do this entirely, or advance and press their Opponents reasons, or arguments any further, than they think themselves able to resolve and dissipate them: Often do they mis-relate, often also mis-understand, them: Often is the Question, they not speaking to the same thing, on both sides stated true: and the Answer very good, because the Objection is proposed amiss, and a Reply shaped, to their own, not to their Adversaries Arguments: and thus the *Judgment*, confined by the *Will* to such a partial information from persons, pleading both their Adversaries cause, and their own, is, if not of an extraordinary apprehension, easily deluded; or if such, much perplexed. The Fathers also, here not consulted by this judgment in their own works, but only considered, as cited by these Authors in some short Sentences disjointed, and separated from the context (which, viewed in the whole piece, perhaps would appear quite of another colour) are made to speak whatever the Controvertist pleaseth; and in all matters disputed, are usually brought in to bear witness on both sides. And by this device of conversing only with one sort, or sect, of Authors, the *Will* renders the *Judgment* of what opinion it pleaseth, by opening to the Understanding, in fair characters, and a full prospect of them, all those Arguments and reasons, that favour one side; and removing quite out of sight, or much disfiguring, what is brought for the contrary. Or at least, if, by many shifts, matters on both sides but can be brought to an *Æquilibrium*; or, by much bandying to and fro, and multiplied replies, be made appear somewhat intricate, and *Quodlibetical*, here also with good reason, we think, we may take that scale, or side, which much complies with our secular advantages. These persons seem to be of the second sort of S. *Austins improbandi* (mentioned before) *qui sentiunt quidem se nescire, sed non ita quærunt, ut invenire possint.*

And, by such a predominancy of the *Will* (either our own, or, if we in minority, their, who have the command and government over us) in these matters of *Science*, it is, that, though the persons be of very different intellects; and some, in all Places and Sects, of excellent parts; yet almost all those of one Nation, or Society; or such, in these, as are more bound together in one interest, from their having the same education under Parents, or other Instructors, that are all of the same perswasion; or, afterward, from their turning usually the same Books, are seen to be of the same Opinions, and to continue the same Sect of Religion; and those, contrarily instituted, and engaged, elsewhere, to be all of another; though these two contrary Opinions (whereof one many times is a truth, the other an error) are never almost supported with equal reason: nor would these opposite influences upon judgments equally piercing happen to be so universal, but from these *Arts* used by a *Will* preingaged. Now, as this is to be esteemed an §. 276.

an unhappy captivity of the Judgment, and a very ſafe courſe for thoſe, who are bred in the boſom of the *Church Catholick*, and who are ſecure under an Eccleſiaſtical Guide; So is it to be looked on as a great miſery in thoſe Sects, divided from ſuch Guide. And it may be rationally preſumed; that, would private intereſt, every where, permit a free ſearch, Truth, in all places, (I mean, ſuch eminent truths, as the *Catholick Church* in her Councils hath recommended to the faith of Chriſtians) would find more Diſciples than Error; as having much more reaſon, and evidence, on its ſide.

§. 277. 3. A third way of blinding and miſleading the *Judgment* is, When the *Will*, yet more candidly, allows and invites the Underſtanding, * to make a free and impartial ſearch into all ſides, and into whatever Authors, or other Teachers, ſeconding, or oppoſing its preſent perſwaſions; and * equally to admit all ſuch arguments produced by theſe *pro* or *contra*, drawn from Scripture, or from Reaſon, that *intrinſecally* relate to the matter in Controverſie: But yet (perhaps, fearing, that, here, all ſtands not right with him) allows it not to ſtudy firſt, and duly examine the main point of *Church-Authority* (which, if found ſo great, as it is pretended, would ſave many other ſearches;) Of Church-Authority I ſay, *viz.* what perpetual power our departing Lord hath left to the Governors thereof, and what aſſiſtance promiſed them, for expoſition of the ſence of the Divine Scriptures, where this is diſputed; and for deciding Controverſies in matters of Faith: And what obligation he hath laid upon all the Church's Subjects to hearken to them, and not to depart from their Directions, and Determinations, *ne circumferantur omni vento doctrinæ in nequitia hominum* (a yoke the pride of the will hath no great mind to). Yet a ſearch is to be undertaken much rather, than all the other; Becauſe, abſtracting from this Guide, after never ſo impartial a view of other intrinſecal arguments belonging to the ſubject debated, an ordinary underſtanding, in points ſo much *above reaſon*, may haply miſtake the Truth: And becauſe matters of Faith and Religion, wherein the Intellect now negotiates, depend chiefly on *Church-Tradition*, not rational-ſeeming proofs; And becauſe a Judgment, left to a free information of it ſelf herein, muſt needs find many perſwaſive arguments to entertain and prefer the Judgment of this Authority, when it is on one ſide, though this naked, and ſeconded with no reaſons at all (that are known to ſuch perſon) for its Propoſals, before all thoſe intrinſecal reaſons relating to the nature of the ſubject, that appear on the other. Such perſwaſive Reaſons, I mean, drawn from Authority, as theſe; That this Authority, that delivers the contrary to what all my other arguments, or reaſons, recommend to me, is by our Lord inſtated in an *Infallibility* in all *neceſſaries:* and that it, not I, alſo is to judge, what, or how much, is neceſſary: Or however, that this Authority (fallible or infallible) is, by the Divine Ordination, in ſuch points of Faith, and Religion, appointed my Guide; and, in any oppoſition of ſuch Authorities happening, the Superior, this Guide: (of which things enough hath been ſaid in the former Diſcourſes:) That, ſetting aſide theſe principal conſiderations, the perſons conſtituting this Authority are alſo of greater parts,

parts, longer ſtudies, and (I have reaſon to preſume) more diſpaſſionate, than my ſelf; and more in number, than I, or thoſe others of my perſwaſion: that they have ſeen and conſidered all thoſe reaſons, that as yet ſway me, and have pronounced contrary: that they may have reaſons for their Deciſions that I have not ſeen, nor they are obliged to ſhew me, ſince my judgment ſtands ſubjected to theirs on another account, than the evidence of argument.

§. 278. Now, in ſuch a caſe, or ſuppoſition, that the Intellect, left free to conſider, doth aſſent to ſuch extrinſecal arguments in behalf of Church-Authority, againſt any Reaſons belonging to the ſubject in debate, that perſwade me contrary to what it hath defin'd; Here, after ſtudying both *Authority*, and *Reaſon*, my final Judgment is, that I ought to join and ſide with the firſt, againſt the ſecond; though theſe reaſons be unſolv'd, or that none better, or none at all, be preſented to me, by the ſaid Authority. And ſo, now, to go againſt *my Reaſon* is to follow my *Judgment*, or *Conſcience*; and, on the contrary; It is to go againſt my *Judgment* or *Conſcience*, if I follow theſe my *reaſons*, or my *private* judgment, as grounded on them.

§. 279. It may be ſome, who pretend that *Conſcience* releaſeth them from *Authority*, have not well conſidered this; and therefore give me leave to dilate a little more upon it. If we look then into Secular Affairs, this matter ſeems decided in our ordinary practice. Do not we commonly, upon receiving the advice of an experienced Friend, a learned Phyſitian, or Lawyer, concerning our Eſtate, or our Health, both believe his Directions good: and according to them, do, and alſo judge we ought to do, many things contrary to our own private Judgments: *i. e.* contrary to thoſe reaſons, which our ſelves have imagined, not to do ſo? Is not *Abraham* ſaid to believe a thing that ſeemed contrary to his own reaſon, *Rom.* 4. 17, 18. And ſo the man in the Goſpel, *Mark* 9. 24. What is the meaning of that ſaying, ordinarily uſed alſo by *Proteſtants*, [Theſe and theſe *reaſons* I have for my *opinion*, but I ſubmit my *judgment* herein to the *Church*]? Is it (as Dr. *Fern* comments on it †) only; I ſubmit my judgment, as to the publiſhing of it? But this is only a ſubmiſſion of ſilence, not of our judgment at all, to the Church; and is a ſubmiſſion, which may well be performed in things, wherein our judgment is utterly fixed and unalterable; namely, in things, whereof we are infallibly certain. Again; What means that of Dr. *Hammond* (*Schiſm* 2. *c.* §. 10. where he ſaith, —— *A meek ſon of the Church of Chriſt, when the Fundamentals of Faith are not concern'd in the conceſſions*, &c. *will chearfully expreſs his readineſs to ſubmit, or depoſit, his own judgment in reverence, and deference, to his Superiors: Submit* and *Depoſit*; means it not, to renounce, and deſert it in ſuch matters; and to believe and hearken to the judgment of the Church, rather than to it? Neither can that of the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 14. 23. *Whatever is not of faith is ſin*, be objected to any for ſo doing; Becauſe, who thus depoſits his judgment, doth it out of faith, namely, that the Church's Judgment is wiſer, ſafer, preferrable to, his own.

† *Conſid. touching Reformation. c.* 1. *n.* 16.

§. 280. Nor can this indeed rightly be conſtrued, a going againſt our own Conſcience, or Judgment, conſidered in general: Becauſe this preferring the Church's, before our own, judgment, is, certainly, an act alſo of our judgment:

ment: Since, when there is ſuch a weighty authority on the one ſide, and ſuch reaſons of our own, but theſe ſhort of certainty, on the other, our judgment here ſits upon, and examines, both; and at length gives ſentence, that, here, it is a ſafer courſe for us to ſubmit to the firſt, than rely on the ſecond. And here then, I only go againſt Conſcience, if I adhere to the ſecond, and forſake the firſt. But indeed, if the Church (which it never doth) ſhould require me to ſubſcribe, not, that I give more credit to her Authority, than to my private Reaſons: but, that I have no private reaſons, or ſcruples, no repugnances of any Veri-ſimilities to the contrary of her Definitions, when indeed I have ſo, nor as yet know how to clear them; ſuch ſubſcription or profeſſion, I grant, would be going againſt my Conſcience, and muſt at no hand be done. This, That a ſubmiſſion of our Judgment, or profeſſing our aſſent to Authority, where we ſee no reaſons confirming its aſſertions, and many, for the contrary, is not, neceſſarily, a going againſt our own Conſcience, or Judgment.

CHAP.

CHAP. XV.

Remedies of the former Deceits of the Will.

Conſiderations,
For remedying the firſt Deceit. §. 281.
Where,
Whether Salvation may be had in any Chriſtian Profeſſion, retaining the Fundamentals of Faith, §. 282.
For remedying the ſecond Deceit, §. 289.
Where,
That Perſons, not wholy reſigned to Church-Authority, ought to be very jealous of their preſent opinions: and indifferent, as Reaſons may move, to change their Religion, Ib.
For remedying the third, §. 291.
Where,
1. *That the Illiterate, or other perſons unſatisfied, ought to ſubmit and adhere to preſent Church-Authority,* §. 292.
That learned Proteſtants *have ſo determined this Point,* §. 294.
That apparent miſchiefs follow the Contrary, §. 296.
2. *That, in preſent Church-Governors divided, and guiding a contrary way, ſuch perſons ought to adhere to the Superiors; and to thoſe, who by their Authority conclude the whole,* §. 298.
3. *As for Church-Authority paſt, ſuch perſons to take the teſtimony, concerning it, of the Church-Authority preſent,* §. 301.
Yet, That it may be eaſily diſcerned by the Modern Writings, what preſent Churches moſt diſſent from the Primitive, §. 302.
Where,
Of the aſperſion of Antiquity *with* Antichriſtianiſm, §. 311.

NOw a Judgment once ſet free from the three former great Arts of the Will to miſguide it, as any ones Secular Intereſt ſhall require, will begin to conſider,

1. In oppoſition to the firſt of them, mentioned before, §. 274. [keeping the judgment in ignorance, as to Divine matters, and employing it wholy about other ſtudies] That, ſince a right perſwaſion in Religion is of ſo great conſequence to ſalvation, All thoſe, who are not ſetled, in their Belief, upon the Baſis of Church-Authority, and ſo, under it remain in a ſufficient ſecurity of their Faith, as to all thoſe points, wherein the ſenſe of the Holy Scriptures is diſputed, and controverted by ſeveral parties (as for example, in theſe: Whether Juſtification is by Faith alone? Whether there be Evangelical Counſels, as well as Precepts? Whether Chriſt §. 281.

our Lord be Co-Eſſential with God the Father? Whether exhibiting his Corporal Preſence in the Euchariſt? Whether there be a *Purgatory* after this life for ſome imperfect ſouls, though departing in God's Grace? or the like;) All ſuch, I ſay, ſince they have taken the guidance of themſelves, in Spirituals, into their own hands, have great reaſon themſelves to fall, moſt attentively, to the ſtudy thereof. For it were to ſerve God too careleſly, and at hap-hazard, to caſt off Church-Authority for the Expoſition and Sence of God's Word in theſe diſputed, and difficult matters, and not himſelf to uſe any other endeavour at all for the right underſtanding of them. And in ſuch endeavour, he ought not only to take a perfunctory view of ſome places, that may ſeem at the firſt ſight to repreſent to him what he would have, but to ſeek out all thoſe Texts that both ſides build upon; and then diligently to examine and compare them. For, though ſome Texts may ſeem never ſo plain, as to the Literal, and Gramatical ſence [as what more clear, than, —— *Accipite, comedite, Hoc eſt Corpus meum*]; yet ſcarce is there any ſentence, where the terms are not capable of ſeveral acceptations, Figurative, and Non-literal; Or, if they be not, all ſides muſt neceſſarily agree in their ſence, and ſo about ſuch Texts be no diſpute; And again, there being a neceſſary conſonancy, and agreement in every title of Scripture, no place, how plain ſoever, for the expreſſion, it ſeems to be, may be ſo interpreted, as to contradict another, that ſeems as clearly to ſay the contrary. He ought alſo to weigh not only the immediate ſence of Scripture, but the neceſſary conſequences; and, ſince whatever things are not oppoſite to Scripture, are truly lawful, and practicable, to diſcern the true, and not only pretended, repugnances thereto; He ought alſo to examine Tranſlations, peruſe the Comments, and Expoſitions of others, Modern, Ancient: For all theſe things that *Authority* moſt exquiſitly doth, whoſe Judgment and Conduct he declines. Laſtly, He muſt be a *Divine*, who will not be guided by *Divines*; for of the true way of Salvation none can ſecurely be ignorant. And what *Prelatical Proteſtant* allows this in an *Independent*, or Fanatick, when he will neither guide his ignorance by following the learned, nor remove it by ſtudy?

Matt. 26.

§. 282. As for Salvation to be had in any Chriſtian Profeſſion, though it may be true in a Church, where all fundamentals are truly believed, and Baptiſm rightly adminiſtred, for ſo many as are invincibly ignorant of any better, or perhaps other communion, as for Children, and Ruſticks, thoſe of an immature age, or of very low employments, void of literature, and publick converſe, and by their mean condition and experience, deſtitute of any improvement of their knowledge; yet for all the reſt, who have better means of underſtanding Divine matters, and of ſearching the grounds of their Faith, and ſtate of their Communion; and on whoſe direction and example, every where depend the other meaner and younger ſort of people, and by their default do miſcarry; || For theſe, I ſay, their caſe ſeems very dangerous, who happen to be in any ſeparated Society out of the external *Catholick* Communion: Since the *One* God will be worſhipped (as † S. *Auſtin* anſwered thoſe Latitudinarian *Donatiſts*) not only in *verity*, but *unity*;

|| 1 *Cor.* 8. 11.

† *Epiſt.* 48.

unity; and, again, hath left marks and Teſtimonies ſufficiently evident for the diſcerning and diſtinguiſhing that *Catholick* Communion wherein he will be worſhipped from all other *Heretical*, or *Schiſmatical*, Societies. All thoſe therefore, who either, through their own fault, do not know this Communion, becauſe they will not ſearch; or, knowing it, yet voluntarily ſtill remain in any other divided from it, muſt needs be in a very perillous Condition. The firſt, becauſe their ignorance, in a thing ſo manifeſt, and withall ſo important, muſt needs be very groſs, and unexcuſable. The ſecond, becauſe any long ſtay in any ſuch ſeparated Society, to one convinced, ſeems both by the Scriptures, and by the Church, frequently prohibited; And, were it not ſo, at leaſt brings ſo much detriment, and damage to the ſpiritual Condition of ſuch a perſon, as is no way to be recompenced, by any other fancied advantages enjoyed, therein. Which things it will not be amiſs to diſcourſe a little more fully, if perhaps ſome *Laodicean* complexion may receive ſome benefit thereby.

§. 283.

1ſt. Then, The remaining in any ſuch Communion is prohibited by the Scriptures, in many places. Eph. 5. 7, 8. *The children of light are to have no fellowſhip with the unfruitful works of darkneſs, nor to be partakers with them, but to reprove them.* —— 2 Cor. 6. 14. *Light and Darkneſs, Juſtice and Iniquity, Believers and Infidels, the Temples of God* [which all good Chriſtians are] *and of Idols, are to have no fellowſhip or communion, together:* But, *Come ye out from among them, and be ye ſeparate, ſaith the Lord.* And, 1 Cor. 3. 16. *Si quis Templum Domini violaverit diſperdet illum Deus.* Nor may ſuch ſeparation be underſtood from Infidels, Heathens, or Non-Chriſtians only: For, 1 Cor. 5. 9, 11. *If a Brother* [*i. e.* one that profeſſeth Chriſtianity with us] *be a Fornicator, an Adulterer, an Idolater, a Drunkard, with ſuch a one* we are charged *not to eat.* [But, to with-draw our ordinary converſe from him: *i. e.* where no duty of charity, either to our ſelves, or to them, or to ſome others, obligeth us to the contrary. And this, for many good ends; as, to preſerve our ſelves from all contagion, and infection, from their vices, or partaking of their puniſhments, or giving ſuſpicion of our conſentment with them in their errors; or ſcandal to others, who, by our example, may uſe the ſame converſe to their hurt: To produce ſome ſhame and confuſion, and ſo perhaps amendment, in them.] Upon this we read St. *Auſtins* Holy Mother *Monica* forbare ſitting at table, or eating with her Son, when addicted to the *Manichean* Hereſie. † —— Matt. 18. 17. *If any Brother* [*i. e.* in Chriſtianity] *refuſe to hear the Church, we are to carry our ſelves to him as to an Heathen* [who were Idolaters] *or a Publican,* [with whom the religious *Jews* forbare to eat, or converſe] Rom. 16. 17. [*Thoſe* [Chriſtians] *that cauſe diviſions contrary to the Doctrine, which we have received, to mark and avoid them.* —— Titus 3. 10. *An Heretick, after admonition, to be rejected,* 2 Theſſ. 3. 14. *If any man obey not my word* [be a Separatiſt from the Church, and her Doctrine] *note that man, and have no company with him.* —— 2 Joh. 10. *If there come any unto you, and bring not this Apoſtolical Doctrine, receive him not into your houſe; nor ſay* χαιρε *God ſave you, to him: For he that ſaith ſo to him communicates with his wickedneſs.* And it ſeems this Apoſtle's practice

† *Auſtin. Confeſſ. l. 3. c. 11.*

‖ *Irenæus l. 3. c. 3.* was according to his rule: For *Irenæus* ‖ ſaith, S. *Polycarp* related of him; That going into a Bath to waſh himſelf, he preſently leaped out of it, and departed, when he ſaw *Cerinthus* there, who denied our Lord's Divinity.

§. 284. The ſame may be gathered from our glorified Lord's own vehement expreſſions after his Aſcenſion, (*Apocal.* 2d. and 3d. Chapter) againſt thoſe new Sects that endeavoured to mingle themſelves with, and to ſeduce the *Catholicks*, by tempting them to compliance, when in perſecution; where he calls them, —— *the Synagogue of Satan*; *Profunda Satanæ*; *Jezabel*, *followers of Balaam*, &c. Praiſeth the Churches of *Epheſus*, and *Philadelphia*, —— *for trying them, and not ſuffering them, and not complying, and denying him, with them; but hating their deeds, as himſelf did*, See *Apocalyps*, 2. 2, 6. —— 3. 8, 9.) and cenſureth others of the Churches for doing the contrary (*Apoc.* 2. 14, 15, 16, 20.) and eſpecially reprehendeth that of *Laodicea*, —— *for her lukewarmneſs, and neither being cold, nor hot*; and then urgeth her to be zealous, *Apoc.* 3. 15, 16, 19. The ſame alſo ſeems to appear by his ſevere cenſure (upon occaſion of the *Samaritan Womans* conſulting him about her Religion) of the *Samaritan*, Schiſmatical, Worſhip (in a Temple built, in oppoſition to that in *Jeruſalem*, ſome 250. years before our Lord's coming, in Mount *Gariſim*: Which one *Manaſſes* the High-Prieſt, expelled from the function of his Office in *Jeruſalem*, procured to be erected, and afterward officiated there) our Lord telling this woman, *That the* Samaritans *knew not what they worſhipped*; *and that ſalvation was of the Jews*. And before this, the ſame appears * from God's great diſpleaſure againſt the Diviſion made by *Iſrael* in ſetting up the Calves, though 'tis probably imagined, worſhipping ſtill the ſame God in the ſame Repreſentation of *Cherubims*, only in another place. And afterward, * from *Elias* his expoſtulation with the people, 3 King. 18. 21. —— *Uſque quo claudicatis in duas partes?* which holds as well for ſeparating Sects, as falſe Religions: God having ſo eſtabliſhed the *Oeconomy* of his Church; as to be worſhipped therein in *unity*, as well as *verity*: *Unus Dominus* [Caput], *unum Corpus, & una fides*, Eph. 4. 4.

From all theſe Texts prohibiting Communication, in our daily converſe, with particular perſons ſo affected, I argue, how much more, we are not to communicate, 1. with whole Congregations of them; and 2. with ſuch Congregations ſeparated from the *Church*, and 3. this, in holy things; laſtly, 4. ſo communicating with *them*, in theſe, as to forbear the ſame Communion with the *Church Catholick*.

§. 285. Yet ſome of theſe, and ſeveral other Texts (See 1 *Cor.* 10. 20, 21. —— 1 *Cor.* 5. 4, 5, 13. —— 2 *Cor.* 6. 14, 17.) ſeem more chiefly to prohibit Communion with ſuch in the *Sacraments* (eſpecially that of the Holy *Euchariſt*) and the publick Divine Worſhip; and this, upon ſome other, yet higher, reaſons: Namely, the duty of the publick owning and profeſſing our Religion, and the keeping it pure from, and unmixt with, any unbelieving, Heretical, or Schiſmatical, Societies. For this Holy Sacrament of feeding at the Lord's Table, being inſtituted as for a ſacred inſtrument of our Communion with the Deity, ſo alſo for a publick *teſſera*, and mark, of a ſtrict league, and amity between all thoſe, who together partake it, ſo that, (as the Apoſtle ſaith,

1 Cor.

1 Cor. 10. 17.) *by being made partakers of that one bread and Body* [of our Lord] *we, though being many, become one bread, and one Body; and so, in this Body members of one another*; things, I say, standing thus in this Grand Sacrament of Union, neither will the honour we owe to God the Father, *who dwelleth in us, and adopts us for his Children* (2 Cor. 6. 16, 18.) Nor, to God the Son, *of whose Body we are members*, (1 Cor. 6. 15, 16.) Nor, to the Holy Spirit, *whose Temples we are*, (1 Cor. 3. 16, 17.) suffer us, by such a sacred, and solemn tye to link and unite our selves to any Congregations, that are once estranged from him, or disclaimed by him. This is mingling *light* with *darkness*: joining the *members of Christ* to a Spiritual *Harlot*, by which they *two* become *one* Body (1 *Cor.* 6. 15, 16.) (For such a vertue hath this Sacrament, as that they become *one Body* amongst themselves, that partake it: ‖) And, *by touching the unclean, our selves also become unclean* (Lev. 5. 2, 3.) For all those separations under the Law of the corporally unclean from the Congregation of the Lord, because they were to be *a sanctified people unto the Lord, and holy as he is holy* (Lev. 11. 43, 44.) were only types of the separation, which ought to be, from such notorious sinners, and such false worshippers of him, as we here speak of: To which the Apostle makes application of them, 2 Cor, 6: 17. —— *Be ye separate; and touch not the unclean thing, saith the Lord*: taken out of *Esa.* 52. 11. And hence also taketh he strict order for the *separation* and *ejection* of such persons out of the Church (especially from the communicating the Sacraments thereof) as of a piece of Leaven from a lump unleavened, that our Christian Passeover may not be celebrated with such a sowr meslange (See 1 *Cor.* 5. 2, 5, 7. 13.) *Ejection*, I say, or casting them out, where the Church hath the power: Or, her going out from them, (2 *Cor.* 6. 17.) where they have the power; but still a separation there must be; else, in consorting with them, we provoke our Lord to jealousie, (1 *Cor.* 10. 22.) as not a true and loyal Spouse to Him, and entirely His.

2 *Cor.* 6. 14.

‖ 1 *Cor.* 10. 16, 17.

To these may be added all those Texts requiring the glorifying of God in our publick worship of him in the Society of his true Church, and in the *Confession* of Christ before *men*: *Confession of him with the mouth, as well as believing on him with the heart* (Rom. 10. 9, 10.) *of all persons with one mouth, as well as with one mind* (Rom. 15. 6.) Which Texts seem in a special manner to imply that Confession, which is made in the *publick Assemblies* of the Church: Which *Assemblies* therefore were never intermitted in its greatest persecutions from the Civil Magistrates.

To these again may be added those many precepts of *Unity* and *Charity* enjoined amongst all the fellow-members of Christ, (*Eph.* 4. 3, 11, 12. —— 1 *Cor.* 10. 16, *&c.* —— *Phil.* 1. 27, 28. —— *Jo.* 10. 4, 5.) which Texts seem to extend and oblige to all the external, as well as internal, acts thereof; especially, for what concerns God's publick service and worship. And that Article of our *Creed*, that we believe *one Church Catholick and Apostolick*, *i. e.* One external, visible Communion upon earth, united in its members, that always is, and shall be such, seems not sufficiently asserted, and professed by any, who forbears to join himself openly unto it. Such a *denial* before *men* of the *Body* of Christ, his *Church*, seems not to fall much short of

of the Crime, of *denying* before *men* the *Head*, *Chriſt* himſelf. But chiefly there, where this Church, the Spouſe of Chriſt, happens to be under any diſgrace, or Perſecution, here our taking up the Croſs with her, and the Doxology of *Confeſſing* him, and her, ſeems yet more zealouſly to be embraced; and no ſuch opportunity of ſo highly promoting our Eternal reward, upon any Secular Inductive whatſoever, to be omitted: For which conſider, *Heb.* 10. 25.

§. 286. 2. This of the *remaining* in any ſuch *ſeparated* Congregation prohibited in Scriptures; and the contrary alſo there required. Next, It is alſo both prohibited by the ancient *Canons* of the *Church*; and diſallowed by her *practice*.

For the *Canons*; ſee thoſe early ones: *Can. Apoſt.* 11, 12, 13. —— 12. —— *Si quis cum damnato Clerico, veluti cum Clerico, ſimul oraverit, iſte damnetur.* —— 11. *Si Quis cum Excommunicato ſaltem in domo locutus fuerit, iſte communione pri-*
‖ *l. 6. c. 13.* *vetur.* Which Canon calls to mind again, 2 *Jo.* 10. And ‖ *Euſebius* reports of *Origen*, when yet a youth; that neceſſitated, by reaſon of poverty, to live in the ſame houſe with *Paulus*, one not Orthodox in the Faith, yet he forbare to be preſent at Prayers with him: —— *Quippe qui, ab ineunte ætate, Eccleſiæ Canonem omnixe obſervaſſet*, probably thoſe *Apoſtolick* ones, before named. See *Concil. Laodicen*: held by the *Catholicks* in the time of the reigning of *Arianiſm* before the Second *General* Council: Where, as it is decreed, —— *Non oportere cum Paganis feſta celebrare*, (*c.* 39.) And, —— *Non oportere a Judæis azyma accipere* (*c.* 38.) So, —— *Non oportere cum Hæreticis, vel Schiſmaticis, orare* (*c.* 33.) And *Non oportere Hæreticorum benedictiones accipere* (*can.* 32.) See *Concil. Carthag.* 4. (held, *A. D.* 436. a little after S. *Auſtin*'s death) *can.* 72. —— *Cum Hæreticis nec orandum, nec pſallendum*: And, *c.* 73. *Qui communicaverit, vel oraverit cum excommunicato, ſive Clericus ſive Laicus excommunicetur.* So it is then, that all *Hereticks* and *Schiſmaticks*, ſuch as make Congregations, and celebrate the publick Divine Worſhip, ſeparate from the *Church*, ſtand Excommunicated and Anathematized, by the ſupreme Church-Authority in ſeveral *Canons* of Councils. And hence all thoſe ſtand ſo too, who communicate with them in ſuch their ſervice: For: This frequenting, and joining with them in their ſervice, is an *external profeſſion* of ſuch *ſeparation*; which *external Profeſſion* always it is, that the *Church*, not knowing Hearts, proceeds againſt in her Cenſures. And the Church, in her expelling ſuch *Congregations* from being members any longer of her Communion, may be imagined, much more, to prohibit any pretender to *her* Communion from being, or appearing, a member of *theirs*. And, though the *modern Church*-laws, in ſeveral caſes, may perhaps have remitted ſome of the *ancient* rigor, that reſtrains our preſence, with known, and declared, *Hereticks*, in the *Catholick* Divine Service, or Sacraments, and hath admitted ſome limitations; Yet the communicating with any of a ſeparated external communion in their Divine Service, or in ſuch Holy things, or Divine Worſhip, as are commonly underſtood, and taken, for a diſtinctive note of ſuch ſeparation from that Church, which is the *Catholick*, ſuch a diſſembling of ones Religion is at no hand lawful: but is a denying, before men, of Chriſt's Church, and ſo of Chriſt: ſince who thus denies conjunction with the *Body*, denies it with the *Head* alſo,

that

that is joined to this Body. Nor was there in any times, the leaſt diſſimulation in any thing required as an external *Teſſera*, and Touch-ſtone of their Religion; I ſay not, a non-profeſſing of our Religion, but a profeſſing againſt it, ever ſuffered, or excuſed, in the greateſt Perſecutions: Though other uſual ceremonies and practices of the Church, not diſtinguiſhing, ſo eſſentially and properly, her Communion (nor this communion made a neceſſary conſequent of them), but inſtituted, and performed for other ends, may, amongſt Separatiſts, be diſpenſed with, and omitted; As faſting, or abſtinence, or days appointed for them: Provided, no great ſcandal happen thereby. But, whatever compliances with Separatiſts for our Secular conveniences may be lawful, yet, ſince all ſuffering for the *Catholick* Religion is a degree of Martyrdom, it is much nobler, by keeping the ſtricteſt diſtance, to aſpire to what is moſt perfect, than, by ſeeking enlargements, to hazard the doing of ſome thing unlawful.

Next: For the Church's ancient *Practice* (*viz.* the *Catholicks* neither going to the *Prayers*, or *Sacraments* of *Sectariſts*; nor admitting theſe to their own) Their *Letters* Commendatory, mentioned, *Can. Apoſt.* 13. called *Epiſtolæ formatæ*, ſufficiently ſhew, how cautious and ſtrict it was: which *Letters*, from the Church's careful avoiding all mixture with Sectaries, were procured, ſo often as any had occaſion to travel from one Church to another; Without which Teſtimony they could not be admitted to their prayers, *&c.* The ſame alſo appears from the ſtrict ſeparation of *Catholicks* from the potent diviſion of the *Arian* Sect. Which *Arians*, though, in many of their Councils, they required ſubſcription of no *poſitive Hereſie*, but only an omiſſion, in their *Creeds*, of ſome Truth, the word ὁμοούσιον; yet were the *Catholicks*, even when much perſecuted by the Secular Princes, and, by the baniſhment of their Paſtors, in ſome places deſtitute of the *Sacraments*, ſtrictly prohibited to come at the *Arian* Aſſemblies; though theſe had the ſame *Sacraments* with them, and poſſeſſion of the Cathedrals, and other Churches: and choſe rather, to relinquiſh their Temples, to pray at home, to live without the Sacraments: nay, to be without theſe in their ſickneſs, and at their death, than to receive them from the *Arians*. See for theſe things, S. *Athanaſ. Epiſt. Synodica ad Antiochenſes*, —— And *Epiſt. ad ubique Orthodoxos* —— S. *Auſtin De vera Religione*, *c.* 5. —— S. *Hilary*, *lib. contra Arian.* S. *Baſil. Epiſt.* 293. to ſome *Egyptian* Biſhops. And ſee, in *Theodoret*, || the jealous deportment of the *Romans* towards *Felix*: who ſubſtituted by the *Arian Emperor* in *Liberius* his place; ſent into baniſhment, —— *Tametſi* (ſaith *Theodoret*) *fidem in Concilio Nicæno expoſitam ipſe ſervavit integram, tamen, quia cum illis, qui eandem labefactare ſtudebant, libere communicarit, nemo ex Roma habitatoribus in Eccleſiam, dum ille intus erat, ingredi voluit.* And this reſolution, ſignified to *Conſtantius*, happily procured the return of *Liberius*. This of the Declaration of the Church, againſt any ſuch *liberty* of Chriſtian *Communion*, whereſoever our Secular Intereſt, or Education, may be apt to fix us. §. 287. || *Hiſt. l.* 2. *c.* 17.

3. But, were there no ſuch bars put in againſt it, by the Scriptures, or H. Church; yet this were enough to diſſwade it; that, by remaining in any ſuch ſeparated Society, either we are put to practiſe ſeveral things contrary §. 288.

to

to a right Faith, and good manners, and offenſive to a good Conſcience: or at leaſt neceſſitated to forego the practice of many other things beneficial, (not to ſay, neceſſary) which are to be enjoyed only in the Communion of this *Catholick Church*, not ſo in others. For a particular Catalogue of which (not to be here too tedious) I refer you to the *Preface* before the former Diſcourſes touching the *Guide* in Controverſies, and to the concluſion of the *third Diſcourſe*, §. 155, *&c.* Laſtly, as for that internal Communion with the Church, which it is granted, ſome, who want the external, may nevertheleſs enjoy; or, the ſecurity of a *votum*, where is an actual defect, of the participation of its *Sacraments*, that ſome may have, they ſeem no way applicable to ſuch perſons as thoſe, who are not by force hindred of her Communion; but, invited to it, do voluntarily deprive themſelves: And, partaking the *Sacraments in voto* ſignifies nothing to us, where, *de facto*, we may have them, and, *de facto*, do refuſe them. And, then, what other advantages can there be, that can make us ſatisfaction for ſuch a loſs?

I will conclude this point, with the Declaration ſent to the followers of the *Donatiſts* (ſome of whom, for their ſtay in that Sect, urged this very excuſe, we are now ſpeaking to, —— *Nihil intereſſe, in qua parte quis Chriſtianus ſit*) by S. *Auſtin*, and the reſt of the *Provincial* Council at *Cirta* in *Numidia*, preſently after that famous Conference with them at *Carthage*, A. D. 411. † —— *Quisquis ab hac Catholica Eccleſia fuerit ſeparatus*, [amongſt whom they reckoned the Sect of the *Donatiſts*] *quantumlibet laudabiliter ſe vivere exiſtimet, hoc ſolo ſcelere, quod a* Chriſti unitate *disjunctus eſt, non habebit vitam, ſed ira Dei manet ſuper eum.* And, as for the *Sacraments* received in that ſeparation. —— *Sacramenta Chriſti* [ſay they, though celebrated in the ſame manner with them, as in the Church] *in ſacrilegio ſchiſmatis, ad judicium habetis; quæ utilia, & ſalutaria, vobis erunt, cum in Catholica pace habueritis Caput, Chriſtum, ubi charitas cooperit multitudinem peccatorum.* Thus much (I fear not needleſly) I have taken occaſion (from §. 283.) to ſet down in oppoſition to that irrational Fancy, *Nihil intereſſe, in qua parte quis Chriſtianus ſit*, not knowing, but that this Diſcourſe may meet with ſome Readers not much averſe from ſuch a perſwaſion. For, by the foreſaid Arts of the Will, men's Judgments are too apt to digeſt opinions very groſs, where the Secular Advantages, by theſe, are very great.

† S. *Auguſt. Epiſt.* 152.

1 *Pet.* 4. 8.

§. 289.

2. Thus much conſidered by a Judgment, ſet at liberty, in order to the firſt Art of the Will to deceive it, *viz.* Its keeping the Judgment in much Ignorance as to the Divine matters, and to a cold Indifferency as to parties; and diverting it wholy to other matters. Next, as to the Second, mentioned before, §. 275. (namely; applying it indeed to the learning of theſe Truths; but this, only from thoſe Authors, and Inſtructors, that are of its own party) a rectified Judgment will as freely conclude, and reſolve; That all thoſe, who are not well ſetled upon this Baſis of *Church-Authority*; and ſo, by a reſigned obedience, have prevented all diſputes, ought rather, in making ſuch a queſt after Divine Truth, in ſo many Controverſies agitated between parties, and in chuſing their Religion, to apply themſelves, for learning it, to the reading of thoſe Books, and Authors, and diſcourſing with thoſe perſons,

ſons, who oppoſe the tenents, in which they have been educated; and to which all ſecular, or carnal advantages do incline them; that thus they may bring things to ſome equipoiſe; and, having firſt heard the plea of both ſides, be able to make a truer Judgment. And if, in the iſſue, neither ſide do ſeem to preponderate, ſhould chuſe rather that, to which their intereſt ſeems more averſe; for they may well imagine, that men are ordinarily ſo far partial to their own ſide, that they would not think both equal, unleſs that againſt them were over-weight: and that a crooked ſtaff, to be made ſtreight, muſt be bent the contrary way.

And, upon this, ſuch Judgment alſo will conſider; That, ſince our firſt perſwaſions, in Religion, and the particular ſect thereof wherein we live, are not taken up upon our own choice, but anothers; who, having ſome command over us, anticipate our Judgment, and educate us in what opinions they pleaſe; hence it is, that our conſtancy and perſeverance, even ſometimes to the loſs of an Eſtate, and Life, or whatever we thus caſually firſt light on (called by the name of *Fidelity* and love of *Truth*; and the contrary, *Perfidiouſneſs*, and *Apoſtaſie*) is indeed, before we have examined things better, only a raſh, and inconſiderate *Obſtinacy*; and that on the contrary, in prudence, every one ought to put himſelf in a great indifferency, to change thoſe firſt principles he is thus ſeaſoned and poſſeſſed with, as he ſhall, by new experience, find cauſe; and to eſteem that only *Conſtancy* in his *Religion*, *i.e.* in his true ſerving of God, to alter every day, and that through a thouſand Secular obſtacles, to any thing, wherein he conceives, he may ſerve him better. As in our manners, when any way deficient, we do this, without reproach.

Yet further will conſider, ſince (as hath been ſhewed) there is but one Communion of all thoſe various Sects, in which, promiſcuouſly, the Education of Chriſtian Youth happens to be moulded, namely, that which adheres to the *Supreme Church-Authority*, that is *Catholick*, and truly diſengaged of *Schiſm*; That all thoſe, who find themſelves to live under ſuch *Superiors*, as are broken off, and ſtand divided, from *their* Superiors, and condemned by them, ought to entertain a great jealouſie of their preſent ſtate, and not acquieſce in any ſuch Government, at adventure; but preſently to reduce their ſubjection to that Authority that is eſtabliſhed by our Lord. Again, in the next place, that ſuch a one ought to improve, or to check, in himſelf, theſe ſuggeſtions of a *change*, as the Religion he deliberates on, is more licentious, or more ſtrict in compariſon of that, which for the preſent he profeſſeth. For, ſtrong inclinations to change to a Religion, that is more rigorous, and mortifying his luſts, that requires much Obedience, Reſignation, and Humility from him, that captivates his underſtanding, as well as curbs his appetites, things nature much reluctſ againſt, we may preſume to proceed from the Spirit of God: But, if to a Religion, that promiſeth him in many things more liberty, to proceed from his luſts.

And, ſuch a happy diſcovery being made by him, ſuch a freed Judgment will proceed to conſider; That, if yet further, by reaſon of the perſecution of ſuch a Religion, in the place where he lives, ſuch a Convert hath an occaſion alſo offered him of leaving Father, or Mother, Friends or Fortunes,

and, among the reſt, not the leaſt, his Reputation, and good Name, in being eſteemed a *Turn-coat*, an *Apoſtate*, a Seducer, to embrace, again, in the Religion he turns to, nothing but Croſſes, and Faſtings, Confeſſions and Penances, Reſignation of Judgment, ſtrict obedience to the Church's, as well as God's Laws, and many more hardſhips, ſet before him, if he purpoſeth to arrive at perfection; ſuch a true enlightned Judgment, I ſay, will here conſider: That this is one of the greateſt Honours, that his Divine Majeſty could do him upon earth; and a happineſs next unto Martyrdom. Laſtly, will conſider, that the wiſdom of God hath permitted ſo many *Sects* and Factions, divided from the true Church, and propagating their Schiſms to their Children, to exerciſe the diligence of ſuch, as have the hap to be ſo miſeducated, to find out that Holy Communion, of which he hath left ſufficient teſtimony, and, after this, to practiſe their Chriſtian Courage and Reſolution, to own and repair to it.

§. 290. I find a lively deſcription, of ſuch fetters in an Hereditary Religion, and of a happy deliverance out of them, by repairing into the Boſom of the Church, made by S. *Auſtin* in an inſtance of the *Donatiſts* (frighted with the *Emperor*'s ſevere Edicts) which, I think, may be uſefully here tranſcribed for a pattern to ſuch others, as are detained at preſent in the like chains, in any other divided Sect. —— *Quam multi* (ſaith he, ſpeaking of the *Donatiſts*) *quod certo ſcimus, jam volebant eſſe Catholici, manifeſtiſſima veritate commoti; & offenſionem ſuorum reverendo, quotidie differebant; Quam multos non veritas, ſed obdurata conſuetudinis grave vinculum, colligabat? —— Quam multi propterea putabant veram Eccleſiam eſſe partem Donati, quia eos ad cognoſcendam talem veritatem ſecuritas* [or much more, *res proſpera* in the continuing in their preſent Sect] *torpidos, faſtidioſos, pigroſque faciebat? Quam multis aditum intrandi obſerabant rumores maledicorum; qui neſcio quid aliud nos in altari ponere jactitabant* [what *maledicency* doth the Church ſtill ſuffer, touching what ſhe affirms to be on her *Altars?*] *Quam multi nihil intereſſe credentes, in qua parte quis Chriſtianus ſit, ideo permanebant in parte Donati, quia ibi nati erant? His omnibus harum legum terror ita profuit; ut nunc alii dicant: Jam hoc volebamus; ſed Deo Gratias, qui nobis occaſionem præbuit; faciendique jam, & delationum moruſus amputavit. Alii dicant: Hoc eſſe verum, jam ſciebamus; ſed neſcio qua conſuetudine tenebamur; Gratias Deo, qui vincula noſtra dirupit, & nos ad pacis vinculum tranſtulit. Alii dicant; Neſciebamus hic* [*i. e.* in the Church] *eſſe veritatem; nec eam diſcere volebamus: Gratias Deo, qui negligentiam noſtram ſtimulo terroris excuſſit, ut ſaltem ſolliciti quæreremus, quod, ſecuri, nunquam noſſe curavimus. Alii dicant; nos falſis rumoribus terrebamur intrare; quos falſos eſſe neſciremus, niſi intraremus; nec intraremus, niſi cogeremur; Gratias Deo, qui expertos docuit, quam vana & inania de Eccleſia ſua mendax fama jactaverit. Alii dicant; putabamus quidem nihil intereſſe, ubi fidem Chriſti teneremus; ſed Gratias Deo, qui nos a diviſione collegit; & hoc uni Deo congruere oſtendit, ut in unitate colatur.* Thus S. *Auſtin*. I need not comment upon it. A return into the Church, upon whatever occaſion, is welcom, and to be wiſhed for: and happy they, who, to preſerve an eſtate here on earth, are reduced into the true way to gain a better in Heaven: or, to eſcape ſome puniſhment here, become freed alſo

Vide in S. Aug. Epiſt. 48.

alſo from that hereafter: But yet, much more acceptable, and praiſe-worthy, is ſuch a Converſion, wherein *fear* and *force* have no hand; and where perhaps this their ſecuring their *eternal* ſtate, and happy condition, muſt be built upon the ruine of their *temporal*.

3. This for remedying the ſecond *Deceit*. For the third (delivered before, §. 277.) *Viz.* The weighing indeed univerſally, and impartially, all the *intrinſecal* reaſons, and arguments, *pro* and *contra*, that relate to the *ſubject* in hand; but not thoſe *extrinſecal* ones alſo, that confirm obedience, and ſubmiſſion of judgment, in all points whatſoever, already determined, to *Church-Authority*: Here alſo a judgment, ſet at liberty, will conſider, 1. That, in points of Controverſie, ſome of them certainly of great conſequence; where both the true ſenſe of the *Scriptures*, and of the *ancient Church*, is debated, with many adherents to either ſide; here all thoſe, who by reaſon of illiterate education, and mechanick imployments, are not able to compare, and weigh Texts of *Scripture*, and ſearch former *Church-Records*; or alſo thoſe, who, after ſuch ſearch (eſpecially if being of no extraordinary capacity) find on all ſides things either, by ſubtile wits, rendred ſo ſmooth and probable, or, by multiplied replies, ſo intricated and involv'd, as they know not which to hold to; or alſo become ſtill of his opinion, whom they read [illegible]; That all theſe, I ſay, can take no other *prudent courſe* (were it no *duty enjoined*) than to repair, and ſubmit their judgment, to *Church-Authority*, *i. e.* to their ſpiritual *Paſtors*, and *Superiors*, ſet over them by our Lord, and ſtating theſe things. §. 291. 1.

Which Authority alſo, if it be ſuppoſed, either as to the underſtanding of Scriptures, or examining of ancient Tradition, liable to error; yet this ſtill ſeems *more* to perſwade their adherence to it, as implying more obſcurity and difficulty in the thing defin'd. And much reaſon have they to preſume, that theſe their ſpiritual Governors, both by reaſon of their convening in a greater body, and their conſiſting of more dignified perſons (probably advanced to ſuch high places by their greater merits) and by their great learning, being acquainted with, and weighing, all the ſame arguments that private men do, and, in charity we ought to think, they as diſpaſſionate as our ſelves; and laſtly, by their ampler fortunes, leſs neceſſitated to ſerve private intereſts, are, by all theſe, the *leſs* liable to error of the two: And that the confining of the belief of ſuch perſons to the directions of ſuppoſed fallible *Superiors* is, of the two evils, the much more tolerable, than the leaving them, in ſuch high and ſpiritual matters, to the roving of their *own fancies*: For thus, in ſtead of ſome few errors of the Church, in matters *obſcure*, will be multiplied thouſands, of ſuch perſons, in matters moſt *evident* and *clear*. §. 292.

S. *Auſtin* ſpeaks much on this ſubject in his Book *de utilitate Credendi*, of the benefit of believing the *Church*, written to his friend *Honoratus* (led away by many extravagant *Manichean* dotages) adviſing him ſubmiſſion of judgment to Church-Authority. —— *Nihil eſt facilius* (ſaith he †) *quam* † *De utilitate Credendi.* *non ſolum ſe dicere, ſed etiam opinari, verum inveniſſe, ſed reipſa difficillimum eſt.* And † —— *Quis mediocriter intelligens non plane viderit ſtultis* [under which name, † *C.* 12. §. 293.

name, he saith, he comprehends all, except those, *quibus ineſt, quanta ineſſe homini poteſt, ipſius hominis Deique firmiſſime precepta cognitio*] *utilius, atque ſalubrius eſſe, præceptis obtemperare ſapientum, quam ſuo judicio vitam degere?* —— *Hoc ſi in rebus minoribus, ut in mercando vel colendo agro,* &c. *expedire nemo ambigit, multo magis in religione. Nam & res humanæ promptiores ad dignoſcendum ſunt, quam divinæ; & in quibuſque præſtantioribus & ſanctioribus, quo majus eis obſequium cultumque debemus, eo ſceleratius, periculoſiuſque peccatur.* And *c.* 17. he argues. —— *Si unaquæque diſciplina, quanquam vilis & facilis, ut percipi poſſit, Doctorem aut magiſtrum requirit, quid temerariæ ſuperbiæ plenius, quam divinorum ſacramentorum libros ab interpretibus ſuis nolle cognoſcere?* And, *c.* 7. —— *Nulla imbutus poetica diſciplina Terentium Maurum ſine Magiſtro attingere non auderes,* —— *Tu in eos libros, qui, quoquomodo ſe habeant, ſancti tamen divinarumque rerum pleni, prope totius generis humani confeſſione, diffamantur, ſine duce irruis, & de his ſine præceptore audes ferre ſententiam,* &c. And, *c.* 16. —— *Cum res tanta ſit, ut Deus tibi ratione cognoſcendus ſit, omnes ne putas idoneos eſſe percipiendis rationibus, quibus ad divinam intelligentiam mens ducitur humana?* Thus he, to induce *Honoratus*, in ſuch divine matters, to yield the guidance of himſelf to *Church-Authority*. And then, the *Church-Authority* he would have him ſubmit to, he deſcribes thus, *c.* 17. —— *Quæ* [Eccleſia] *uſque ad confeſſionem generis humani, ab Apoſtolica ſede per ſucceſſiones Epiſcoporum, fruſtra Hæreticis circum latrantibus, & partim plebis ipſius judicio, partim Conciliorum gravitate, partim etiam miraculorum Majeſtate damnatis, culmen authoritatis obtinuit: Cui nolle primas dare, vel ſummæ profecto impietatis eſt, vel præcipitis arrogantiæ. Nam ſi nulla certa ad ſapientiam, ſalutemque, animis via eſt, niſi cum eos rationi præcolit* [prepares them] *fides, quid eſt aliud ingratum eſſe opi, atque auxilio divino, quam tanto labore, prædita* [prædictæ rather] *authoritati velle reſiſtere?* Again, *c.* 16. —— *Quæ authoritas ſepoſita ratione (quam ſinceram intelligere, ut ſæpe diximus, difficilimum ſtultis eſt) dupliciter nos movet, partim miraculis* [very frequent in his times; See *De Civit. Dei. l.* 22. *c.* 8.] *partim ſequentium multitudine.* And, *c.* 14. —— *Quæ celebritate, conſenſu, vetuſtate, roboratur.* And, *c.* 11. —— *Si jam ſatis tibi jactatus videris, finemque hujuſmodi laboribus vis imponere, ſequere viam Catholicæ diſciplinæ, quæ ab ipſo Chriſto per Apoſtolos ad nos uſque manavit, & abhinc ad poſteros manatura eſt.* I have given you S. *Auſtin*'s advice ſomewhat more largely, as hoping his words will have more weight.

§. 294. And becauſe, if this obligation of ſubmiſſion of judgment to Authority for the unlearned *not able* to examine Controverſies, or the learned, after examination, in ſome degree *unſatisfied*, be received for a truth, thus the *greateſt part* of Chriſtians, are, hereby, for ever ſetled in their *Religion*, and *belief*, as to all points determined by the Church, I will here alſo ſet down, for the benefit of ſuch Readers, as moſt value their judgment, the teſtimony of ſeveral learned *Proteſtants* in confirmation of it; ſeveral of which have been mentioned in the former Diſcourſes. The Reader, who thinks the allegation of Witneſſes needleſs in a matter ſo evident, and would only know, when *Eccleſiaſtical Authorities* divide and diſſent, to which of them his ſubmiſſion is due, may, omitting them, paſs on to, §. 296.

In

In confirmation hereof, then, first consider that noted passage of Dr. *Field* in the Preface of his Book, recommending to Christians chiefly the discovery of the *True Church*, and, when this found, submission to it. —— *Seeing* (saith he) *the Controversies of Religion in our times are grown in number so many, and in matter so intricate, that few have time, and leisure, fewer strength of understanding to examine them, what remaineth for men desirous of satisfaction in things of such consequence, but diligently to search out, which, amongst all the* Societies *of the World, is that* blessed company of Holy Ones, *that Houshold of Faith, that Spouse of Christ, and Church of the Living God, which is the Pillar, and Ground of Truth, that so he may embrace her Communion, follow her Directions, and rest in her* Judgment. §. 295. *n.* 1.

In the same manner Dr. *Hammond* writes, in his *Answer* to the *Catholick Gentleman*, cap. 2. p. 17. —— *When the person is not competent to search grounds* [I add, or not so competent as those, to whose definition he is required to submit] *a bare yielding to the judgment of Superiors, and a deeming it better to adhere to them than to attribute any thing to his own judgment, a believing so far as not to disbelieve, may rationally be yielded to a Church, or the Governors of it, without deeming them inerrable.* —— And in his *Treatise* of *Heresie*, §. 13. *n.* 2, 3. he speaks thus of the Christians security, from the Divine Providence, in his adherence in matters of Faith to Church-Authority. —— *If we consider Gods great, and wise, and constant Providence, and care over his Church, his desire that all men should be saved, and in order to that end, come to the knowledge of all necessary truth; his promise, that he will not suffer his faithful Servants to be tempted above what they are able; nor permit scandals, and false teachers to prevail to the seducing of the very Elect, his most pious godly Servants; If, I say, we consider these, and some other such like general promises of Scripture, wherein this Question* [about the errability of Councils] *seems to be concerned, we shall have reason to believe, that God will never suffer all Christians to fall into such a temptation, as it must be, in case the whole Representative, should* err in matter of Faith [I add, to define, therein, any thing contrary to the Apostle's *depositum*, and which Christians may not safely believe, or, without Idolatry, practise,] *and therein find approbation, and reception amongst all those Bishops, and Doctors of the Church diffused, which were out of the Council. And, though, in this case, the Church might remain a Church (and so the destructive gates of hell not prevail against it) and still retain all parts of the Apostles* Depositum *in the hearts of some faithful Christians, which had no power in the Council to oppose the Decree; or, out of it, to resist the general approbation; yet still the testimony of such a General Council, so received, and approved, would be a very strong argument, and so a very dangerous temptation to every meek and pious Christian; and it is piously to be believed, though not infallibly certain, —— That God will not permit his servants to fall into that temptation.* Thus he. [But, if here the Doctor be asked, why, upon these considerations, he doth not submit to all those *latter Councils* held in the Church, that have delivered something opposite to the *Protestant Tenents:* For example, all those Councils concerning *Transubstantiation*, held before *Luther*, I suppose his Answer is ready, because these were not *General*, nor *universally accepted*; But, since these were the *most* §. 295. *n.* 2.

General,

General, that the Church's Subjects have had in those times for their direction; and had also the *most universal* acceptation, that those times could afford, unless he would have also the *Berengarians*, the persons condemned in them, to *accept* them (an acceptation most unreasonably demanded,) why do not here also *Gods Providence*, and *Promises*, stand engaged in compassion to the *meek* and *pious*, Subjects of the Church, that these Councils err not, nor the Christians of those times fall into such a *temptation*, as it must needs be, if these, the *greatest Representatives* the Church had in those days, should misinstruct them in a matter of so great consequence, as is the committing of Idolatry ever since?]

See also his *Comment* on 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. [*The Church the Pillar and Ground of Truth.*] *According to this it is* (saith he) *that Christ is said*, Ephes. 4. 12. *to have given not only Apostles*, &c. *but also Pastors and Teachers*, i. e. *the Bishops in the Church, for the compacting the Saints into a Church; for the building up of the Body of Christ, confirming and continuing them in all truth, that we should be no more like Children carried about with every wind of doctrine. And so again, when Heresies came into the Church in the first ages, 'tis every where apparent by* Ignatius *his Epistles, that the only way of avoiding error and danger, was to adhere to the Bishop in communion and doctrine; and whosoever departed from him, and that form of wholsom words kept by him, was supposed to be corrupted*, &c. And in this *Treatise* of *Schism*, chap. 2. §. 10. he speaks in this manner, —— *A meek Son of the Church of Christ will certainly be content to sacrifice a great deal for the making of this purchase*, i. e. *of enjoying the Church's communion; and when the fundamentals of the faith, and superstructures of Christian practice, are not concern'd in the concessions, he will chearfully express his readiness to submit, or depose his own judgment in reverence and deference to his Superiors in the Church, where his lot is fallen.* [Methinks he might better have said *where his obedience is due*: For, the Church, where his lot is fallen, may, by *Heresie*, or *Schism*, stand divided from the Church-Catholick.] Here he allows depositing of our judgement in deference to our Superiors, *where the Fundamentals of Faith*, &c, *are not concerned*; But would not one think rather, that in *these points* especially a person, to be safe, should adhere to the Church's judgment rather, than his own? Suppose a *Socinian* in the Point of *Consubstantiality*.

§. 295. *n.* 3. Doctor *Jackson* on the Creed, *l.* 2. §. 1. *c.* 6. *p.* 175. in stating the Question, ‖*Whether the injunction of publick Ecclesiastical Authority may oversway any degree of our private perswasion concerning the unlawfulness of any opinion, or action*, goes on thus, *Superiors* (saith he) *are to be obeyed in such points as their Inferiors are not at leisure to examine; or not of capacity to discern; or not of power or place to determine, whether they be lawful or no.* Again, *p.* 170. In case of an *Equilibrium* in ones perswasion, he argues thus. *Wheresoever the perswasions or probabilities of the goodness of any action are as great, as the perswasions and probabilities of the evil, that may ensue,* —— *a lawful Governors command must in this case rule all private choice, either for doing, or omitting it.* The case is all one as in things meerly indifferent: for here is an indifferency of perswasions. But suppose we have not such indifferency, yet, p. 172. ——*Whilst*

‖ *P.* 170.

—— *Whilst men of skill and judgment* (saith he) *appointed by God to advise in such matters, are otherwise perswaded than we in private are, the rule of Christian modesty binds us to suspect our own perswasion, and consequently to think there may be some good even in that action, wherein heretofore we thought was not.* —— *And the performance of obedience it self is a good, and acceptable action in the sight of God.* [Now what he saith here concerning the *goodness* of an *action*, holds as well concerning the *truth* of an *opinion*.] Again, *Ibid. p.* 174. —— *True spiritual obedience, were it rightly planted in our hearts, would bind us rather to like well of the things commanded for authorities sake, than to disobey authority for the private dislike of them. Both our disobedience* [*i. e.* dissent, or non-submission of judgment] *to the one, and dislike of the other, are unwarrantable, unless we can truly derive them, from some formal contradiction or opposition, between the publick or general injunction of Superiors, and express law of the most High.*

And, *c.* 4. *p.* 165. —— *Sundry* (saith he) *in profession Protestants, in eagerness of opposition to the Papists, affirm; that the Church, or spiritual Pastors, must then only be believed, then only be obeyed, when they give sentence according to the evident and express law of God, made evident to the heart, and consciences of such, as must believe and obey them. And this, in one word, is to take away all authority of spiritual Pastors; and to deprive them of all obedience, unto whom doubtless God, by his word, hath given some special authority and right, to exact some peculiar obedience of their Flock. Now if the Pastor be then only to be obeyed, when he brings evident commission out of the Scripture for those particulars, unto which he demands belief or obedience, what obedience do men perform unto him more, than to any other man whatsoever? For whosoever he be, that can shew us the express undoubted command of God, it must be obeyed of all. But whilst it is thus obeyed, it only, not he, that sheweth it unto us, is obeyed. And if this were all the obedience, that I owe unto others, I were no more bound to believe or obey any other man, than he is bound to obey, or believe me: The Flock no more bound to obey the Pastors, than the Pastors, them. Yet certainly God, who hath set Kingdoms in order, is not the Author of such confusion in the spiritual regiment of his Church.* Thus Doctor *Jackson* tying all to obedience or submission to the judgment of their spiritual Guides, save only those who are certain of a *formal contradiction* between God's Laws, and their Injunctions.

To this may be added that much noted place of Mr. *Hooker* in his *Preface* §. 295. *n.* 4. to *Ecclesiastical Policy*, §. 6. commenting there on *Deut.* 17. 8, *&c.* where it is said, *vers.* 11. —— *According to the sentence of the law which they shall teach thee, and according to the judgment which they tell thee, thou shalt do; thou shalt no decline from the sentence which they shall shew thee, to the right hand, nor to the left.* —— *God was not ignorant* (saith he) *that the Priests, and Judges, whose sentence in matters of controversie, he ordained, should stand; both might, and oftentimes would, be deceived in their judgment. However, better it was in the eye of his understanding, that sometimes an erroneous sentence definitive should prevail, till the same authority, perceiving such oversight, might afterwards correct, or reverse it, than that strifes should have respit to grow, and not some speedily to some end.* And here he answers the objection; that men must do nothing

thing againſt Conſcience, ſaying, —— *Neither wiſh we, that men ſhould do any thing which in their hearts they are perſwaded they ought not to do: But we ſay, this perſwaſion ought to be fully ſetled in their hearts, that, in litigious and controverted cauſes of ſuch quality, the will of God is, to have them to do, whatſoever the ſentence of judicial, and final deciſion ſhall determine; yea, though it ſeem in their private opinion* [*i. e.* according to their own reaſon and arguments drawn *a parte rei*] *to ſwerve utterly from that which is right: as, no doubt, many times the ſentence amongſt the Jews did, unto one, or other, part contending. And yet in this caſe, God did then allow them to do that, which in their private judgment ſeemed, yea and perhaps truly ſeemed, that the law did diſallow. For, if God be not the Author of confuſion, but of peace,* &c. And again, —— *Not, that I judge it a thing allowable for men to obſerve theſe laws, which in their hearts they are ſtedfaſtly perſwaded to be againſt the law of God; But their perſwaſion in this caſe* [*i. e.* where their Superiors have determined otherwiſe,] *they are bound for the time* [*i. e.* till the ſame Authority reverſe it and releaſe them] *to ſuſpend,* &c. —— *unleſs they have an infallible Demonſtration.* Thus he. Where, you ſee, he grounds their yielding to Authority, and changing their former perſwaſion, upon a *non-certainty* of ſuch perſwaſion. As for his limited expreſſion before, —— *in litigious and controverted cauſes of ſuch quality*, whatever he meaneth thereby, the Commiſſion and Injunction, *Deut* 17. extends to *all* litigious, and controverted cauſes whatſoever; As alſo it is more clearly drawn, 2 *Chron.* 19. 5, 8, 10, 11. Where it runs, —— *What cauſe ſoever ſhall come to you of your brethren, between blood and blood, between law and commandment, ſtatutes and judgments, ye ſhall,* &c. And note alſo, that the command, Deut. 17. 10. *Thou ſhalt obſerve to do according to all that they inform thee*, requires not only a *paſſive*, (willingly paying mulcts, or undergoing puniſhments) but *active*, obedience: Again, an *active* obedience, not only in doing ſomething thought by me *lawful*, but to which I think I am *not obliged*; but in doing alſo of ſomething, where the *lawfulneſs* of it is queſtioned by me; which thing alſo, here by the text, I am to do, if they command me. And therefore after ſuch Injunction I ought to alter my former perſwaſion concerning it, and to believe, either that *in general* it is lawful to be done, or at leaſt lawful to be done *by me*, not certain of the contrary, *rebus ſic ſtantibus*, and ſuch ſentence paſt.

§. 296. To all theſe Teſtimonies concerning the obligation which *illitterate* and *ignorant*, or alſo, though *learned*, after much examination, *doubting* and *unſatisfied*, perſons have to ſubmit their judgment to Church-Authority, I may add the apparent *miſchiefs* which follow the contrary, obſerved amongſt *Proteſtants* (neglecting this duty) from the beginning of the *Reformation*, *Luther* himſelf much lamenting the *diviſions* he ſaw among his Diſciples even in his own days, —— *Ego* (ſaith he †) *qui jam ſum in miniſterio Chriſti viginti annis, quanquam nihil ſum, vere poſſum teſtari, me plus quam viginti ſectis eſſe petitum,* &c. And, in *Gen. c. 6.* publiſhed not long before his death: *Quantum ſectarum excitavit Satan nobis viventibus? Quid futurum eſt nobis mortuis? Profecto tota agmina Sacramentariorum, Anabaptiſtarum, Aminomorum, Servetianorum, Campaniſtarum,* &c. And himſelf alſo is much noted for his varying from

† *Prefat. coment. in Galat.*

from himſelf in his opinions often changed. But ſtill theſe diviſions are more apparent in the longer courſe of his Schiſm; which *daily* multiplies and branch-eth it ſelf into more and more clefts and ſects, and ſome of them moſt groſs, and ridiculous, and for which it is hard to find names; and which their for-ſaken Leaders are much aſhamed of, whilſt the *Plebeians* will neither ſtudy truth themſelves, nor follow the learned; The miſtakes of theſe perſons in ſuch high and Divine matters, being *greater*, as their *ſcience leß*: and their opinions, ſince weakly grounded, *floating* and *unconſtant*: and, from the uſually prevailing intereſts of the fleſh, inclined to *liberty* and *ſenſuality*.

Of which *Diviſions*, *Grotius*, in ſeveral of his writings, ſadly complains, as §. 297. cauſed by this, that they will pitch upon no *Superior* and *common* authority, by which they will be content to be guided, and regulated in their Faith. —— *Proteſtants* (ſaith he in his laſt reply to *Rivet* †) *Nullo inter. ſe communi eccleſiaſtico regimine ſociantur: quæ cauſæ ſunt, Cur factæ partes in unum Proteſtantium corpus colligi nequeant*; *immo & cur Partes aliæ atque aliæ ſint exurrecturæ*. And in the *Preface* to his *Votum pro Pace*, ſpeaking of their primitive Diſſentments. —— *Confeſſiones* (ſaith he) *factæ ſunt variis in locis variæ, atque inter ſe pugnantes: & non modo quæ factæ erant partes non potuere unquam inter ſe coaleſcere, ſed & novæ quotidie exortæ ſunt particulæ tot, ut nemo ſit, qui earum inire poſſit numerum: &, ut facunda eſt iſta ſeges, (unoquoque ſibi licere credente, quod alius ante uſurpavit) credibile eſt, novas quotidie extituras.* A preſage at this time too much verified in this our Nation. But *Dudithius*, the famous Biſhop of *Quinqueccleſiæ* in his diſconſolate Letter to *Beza*, when *Dudithius* now a *Proteſtant*, and married, and beginning to ſtagger in his new Religion, that had diſpenſed with his *Celibacy*, much more deplores theſe their inteſtine diſcords, and ſchiſms in a ſchiſm. There, † —— *Si quæ aliquando* (ſaith he) *inter eruditos, ex quodam diſputationis quaſi calore, Controverſiæ extiterunt, illis ſtatim Concilii, ſive etiam Pontificis, decreta finem impoſuerunt. At noſtri quales tandem ſunt? palantes, omni doctrinæ vento agitati, & in altum ſublati, modo ad hanc, modo ad illam, partem differuntur. Horum quæ ſit hodie de Religione ſententia, ſcire fortaſſe poſſis; ſed quæ cras de eadem futura ſit opinio, neque ille, neque tu certo affirmare queas.* Again, —— *Eccleſiæ ipſæ pugnant inter ſe capitalibus odiis, & horrendis quibuſdam Anathematiſmis* [Perhaps looking at the Diſſentions then between the followers of *Luther*, *Zuinglius*, *Oecolampadius*, *Calvin*, &c. not yet healed.] *Ipſi, qui ſummi haberi volunt, Theologi, a ſeipſis indies diſſident: fidem cudunt, & a ſua ipſius, quam paulo ante profeſſi fuerant, & ab aliorum omnium, fide abhorrentem; denique menſtruam fidem habent* [perhaps looking at the often varyings of *Luther*, *Melanchthon*, *Bucer*, and others, from their own former opinions, and doctrine]. Thus *Dudithius*. For, though the Churches make ſome particular ſtanding *Articles* to bind together their own Subjects, yet both the Articles of the ſeveral Churches do not accord one with another, in ſome principal Points (as appears in the *Lutheran*, *Calviniſt*, *Belgick*, *French*, *Engliſh*, reformed Churches;) and the *Subjects* of each *Church* do, upon the reforming Principles, without ſcruple, break theſe *Bonds*, upon any new greater veriſimilies, thinking their *Chriſtian liberty* infringed by them. And certainly, whatever deviation from *Truth*,

† *Apollog. Diſcuſſio p.* 255.

† *Apud. Bezam. Epiſt.* 1.

and *former Tradition*, we may ſuppoſe the firſt *Reformers* to have made, yet if they could have reſtrained the people their Subjects from following their example, and from taking that liberty of diſſenting from them, which they, being alſo Subjects, took of diſſenting from their Superiors, both the whole Body of the *Reformation* would have had much more unity and peace, and ſuch perſons much leſs error.

§. 298. 2. Advanced thus far (learned *Proteſtants* conſenting) That all ſuch perſons, as we here ſpeak of, are to conform to, and to ſuffer themſelves, in matters of Religion, to be guided by Church-Authority: Next, a Judgment freed from the intereſts of the Will, may eaſily further add: That where theſe Eccleſiaſtical Governors happen to differ amongſt themſelves, and guide a contrary way, here, ſince theſe are placed, for avoiding ſchiſms, in a due ſubordination, ſuch perſons, in ſuch caſe, owe their obedience to the Superiors of them: To which, in all regular Governments, the inferior Magiſtrates, if they do not, ought to give place. —— *Si aliquid* (ſaith St. *Auſtin* †) *Proconſul jubeat, & aliud jubeat Imperator, numquid dubitatur, iſto contempto, illi eſſe ſerviendum?* [*i. e.* in things, which our Eccleſiaſtical Guides do not inſtruct us to be contrary to the Divine Laws.] So, as to ſpiritual matters, and the ſenſe of Scripture, a *Provincial*, and a *National*, Synod guiding ſuch perſons ſeveral ways, their obedience is due to the *National*; again, a *National*, and a *Patriarchal* Council of all the *Weſt*, or a *General*, determining matters in a diverſe manner, the obedience of ſuch perſons is due to the *Patriarchal*, or *General*, not the *National*, Council. And the ſame it is, in any Patriarchy, or Province, in the intervals of Synods, as to the ſubordinate Paſtors and Prelates.

† *De verbis Dom. Serm. 6.*

2.

See the obedience required by the Church of *England* from all inferior *Clergy*, or Synods, to a *National* Council, in the Canons made 1603. *Can.* 139, and 140. —— *Whoſoever ſhall hereafter affirm, that the ſacred Synod of this Nation is not the true Church of* England *by repreſentation:* —— *Or, that no manner of perſon either of the Clergy or Laity, not being themſelves particularly aſſembled in the ſaid ſacred Synod, are to be ſubject to the Decrees thereof*, &c. *let him be Excommunicated.* And as of perſons, ſo Churches. —— *That Church* (ſaith Biſhop *Bramhal* †) *which ſhall not outwardly acquieſce, after a legal determination* [*i. e.* of its Superiors] *and ceaſe to diſturb Chriſtian unity, though her judgment may be ſound, her practice is ſchiſmatical.* And elſewhere † —— *If a Superior preſume to determine contrary to the determination of the Church* [*i. e.* of his Eccleſiaſtical Superiors] *it is not rebellion but loyalty to diſobey him* [and obey them.] And, —— *I acknowledge* (ſaith Dr. *Hammond* †) *as much as* C. G. *or any man, the Authority of a General Council againſt the diſſent of a Nation, much more of a particular Biſhop.* And, in his Book of *Schiſm*, p. 54, and 66. He grants it Schiſm, for the *Biſhop* to withdraw his obedience from the higher power of the *Metropolitan*, or *Primate*, as well as for *Presbyters*, from the *Biſhop*. Now from theſe I collect, that if theſe inferior Synods, or Clergy, are to yield ſuch external obedience to their reſpective Superiors: Then are the Subjects of theſe, when ever a lower Church-Authority claſheth with an higher (either in ſubmiſſion of their judgement, or of their ſilence) to

† *Schiſm guarded. p. 2.*
† *Vindic. of Church of* Engl. *p.* 12.
† *Anſw. to Cath. Cenſ. c.* 8. §. 1.

adhere

adhere to the higher; nor are the one freed from this duty, becauſe the other neglect it. So ſome *National*, and a *Patriarchal* Council diſſenting, or ſome *Metropolitan*, and his *Patriarch*; here the forenamed perſons, being the ſubjects of both, owe their ſubmiſſion of judgment only to the higher Church-Authority of the two; which Authority if the forecited *Proteſtants* allow the lower to *diſſent* from, yet not to *gain-ſay*.

§. 299. Nor is it reaſonable for any to decline here the preſent Supreme Authority, that is extant, and in being; and transfer ſuch his obedience, and ſubmiſſion to a future, that hath no being; as to transfer it from his *Primate*, or *Patriarch*, or ſo large and univerſal Councils, as have been convened in his own, or in former times, to a future, abſolutely *General*, Council; For thus, ſo many only are ſubject to the preſent ſupreme Powers, as are content to be ſo, if an appeal to a future Authority ſtraight unties them from it. And yet more unreaſonable this, if this appeal is to ſuch a future Council, as probably can never be; namely, where either the Aſſembly, or the approbation of it, muſt be *abſolutely Univerſal*, either as to the whole Body of *Chriſtian Biſhops*; or, at leaſt, as to ſome *Biſhops* of every *Province*; an uſual demand of the *Reformed*. For ſuch Provinces as are cenſured, or condemned by the Council (which thing often happens) it cannot be preſumed, that they will ever accept it: No more than the Council of *Trent*, ſuppoſed never ſo univerſal, as to the reſt of Chriſtianity, would have been accepted by the *Proteſtant Biſhops*, who fell under its cenſures.

§. 300. But, if the preſent ſupreme Church-Authority in actual being is that, to which ſuch perſons, in any conteſts of Superiors, always owe their ſubmiſſion, the moſt of thoſe, who have not skill to comprehend or decide to themſelves *Controverſies*, yet have light enough to diſcern this their *Superior Guide*: For example: Whether a *Patriarch*, or a *Primate* be of an higher authority: Whether an *Occidental* Council at *Trent*, under *Pius*: Or a *National* at *London*, under K. *James*, be the Superior and more comprehenſive, and univerſal: For the Subordinations of *Clergy*, and their Synods are well known; and, amongſt Sects, that are in corners, the *Church-Catholick* ſtands like *a City ſet on a Hill*, and *a light on a Candleſtick*. —— *Quæ uſque ad confeſſionem generis humani; ab Apoſtolica ſede per ſucceſſiones Epiſcoporum, fruſtra Hæreticis circumlatrantibus*, &c. (as St. *Auſtin* before, §. 293.) *culmen authoritatis obtinuit*; and which its very Adverſaries ſhew (but as an intolerable ambition in it) to be that body, which challengeth, in our Lord's name, obedience from all the world Chriſtian, and, hitherto, hath out-numbred any other Chriſtian Society of one Communion. For all Sects, as they divide from it, ſo alſo moſt certainly (from the ſame continued liberty againſt Authority) among themſelves. And therefore, though ſuch others, as by their mean education, and low employments, know no more of the Church, its Governors, or Doctrine, than what their *Pariſh-Prieſt* (perhaps factious) teacheth them: and ſo, without aſcending higher, here terminate their obedience, may be excuſed by invincible ignorance for a thing, that is their *unhappineſs* indeed, but not their *crime*; yet thoſe, who by their more liberal Education, and ingenuous employments, cannot be inculpably ignorant of ſuch Au-

thority, and whose example the ruder sort are steered by, if they neglect to range themselves under it, shall bear their own judgment, and also that of their followers. And, if any Authority, canonically subject to another, shall rebel against it, and declare it self, as to some part of the Church, supreme; and will govern that part independently, what less can it expect from the Divine Justice, than that its Subjects, likewise animated by its example, should revolt from it; and as it reforms from it self, against others above it, so it should suffer more Reformations still, for themselves, from others below it; and the measure meted by it to others be meted again by others to it; till all divine matters, not on a sudden (which is not the ordinary course of God's long-suffering) but in process of time, be brought, in such part, to meer Confusion and Anarchy.

§. 301. This from §. 292. 1. That such, as are wholy unstudied in Controversies; or, after reading them, still unsatisfied, are to submit their judgments to the *present* Church-Authority; 2. And then, this divided, to the highest in actual being; which without much search cannot but be known to the greatest part of Christians.

3. Next, as to Church-Authority *past*, with which many would evacuate the present, here also such, as cannot search and examine; or, in examining, cannot clear to themselves its certain Traditions, ought also, concerning it, to take the judgment of the *present* Church; for, whose can they prudently prefer to it? But yet, give me leave to add one thing more, that, without looking into the Ancients themselves, for which few have leisure, or Books, such persons may easily discern by many other Symptoms, and evidences, and by their travelling no further, than the modern writings, on what side *Antiquity* stands, as to matters of religion in present debate, and which of the opposite parties it is, that hath deserted, and receded from it. Of whom you may see what hath been said already to this purpose, in 3 *Disc.* §. 78.)

§. 302. 1. For first, He, that is acquainted only with the modern writings, will find the one party, in general, much claiming, and vindicating *liberty* of *Opinion*, of *Judgment*, of *Conscience*; and endeavouring to prove the *Fallibility* of whatever *Authority*, whereas the other, generally, presseth obedience, and adherence to *Authority*; and defends the *Infallibility* also of it, as to all *necessaries*. Which argues, that such *Authority* pincheth the one, promotes the other.

§. 303. 2. Again, As to this Church-Authority past, whether taken collectively in its *Councils*; or disjunctively, the particular *Fathers*: As to the first; He will find the one party, * usually disparaging, and weakning, upon some pretence or other, most of those *Councils*, formerly held in the Church: * Requiring such conditions of their power to oblige obedience, as indeed neither past Councils were, nor future can be, capable of; I mean either, as to such an universal Convention, or acceptation, as this Party demands, he will find them * urging much the Non-necessity of Councils; the difficulty to know the right qualifications of the persons; the legality of their proceedings; the sense of their Decrees: * Quarrelling about the calling of them; the pre-

preſiding in them; the paucity of their members; inequality of Nations: Pretending their contradictions (*Councils againſt Councils*, ſaith Mr. *Chillingworth* †) their being led by a faction; * carping at their *Anathema's*; even thoſe of the very firſt Councils. [—— *The Fathers of the Church* (ſaith Mr. *Chillingworth* †) *in after times* [*i. e.* after the Apoſtles] *might have juſt cauſe to declare their judgments touching the ſenſe of ſome general Articles of the Creed. But to oblige others to receive their Declarations, under pain of damnation* [*i. e.* of Anathema] *what warrant they had, I know not. He that can ſhew, either that the Church of all ages was to have this Authority; or, that it continued in the Church for ſome ages* [*viz.* for the four firſt *General* Councils] *and then expired, let him; for my part, I cannot.* Thus he;] Queſtioning their making more new *Articles* of *Faith*, after the declaration of the Third *General* Council at *Epheſus* againſt it. All theſe, I ſay, are manifeſt Indications concerning ſuch *Queſtioners*, that the forepaſt Councils are no friends to their cauſe. † P. 376. † P. 200.

3. Next; For the *Fathers* apart; he will find the ſame Party * frequent in alledging the corruptions, and interpolations of thoſe writings, which it confeſſeth theirs; * affirming ſeveral writings, which the reſt of the world admits for genuine, to be ſuppoſititious, and none of theirs; will find them * complaining ſometimes of their obſcurity; ſometimes of their Rhetorick, and Allegories (which occaſion often a miſtake of their opinion;) and their uſing terms in a much other ſenſe, than the modern do: * Repreſenting them, as to the many matters now in Controverſie, impertinent, or ambiguous, confuſed, not clear, (by their own judgment then, the *Fathers* not clear on their ſide:) * Diſcovering their *nakedneſs* as much as they can; and laying open their errors, Repugnances and Contradictions: Contradictions of one to another; of the ſame to himſelf; —— [*Some Fathers againſt others, the ſame Fathers againſt themſelves: A conſent of Fathers of one age againſt a conſent of Fathers of another age; the Church of one age againſt the Church of another age*; ſaith Mr. *Chillingworth*. †] * Allowing certain Traditions hardly of any thing, ſave of the Holy Scriptures; And, few, or no, *Traditive* interpretations thereof. I have the words from Mr. *Chillingworth*. [*No Tradition* (ſaith he †) *but only of Scripture can derive it ſelf from the Fountain* [our Lord and his Apoſtles:] *but may be plainly proved, either to have been brought in, in ſuch an age, after Chriſt; or, that in ſuch an age it was not in.* And, —— *Traditive Interpretations of Scripture are pretended; but there are few, or none to be found.* So he. * Alledging, that the *Fathers* transferred ſeveral conceits and cuſtoms, into the *Church*, from their new-deſerted *Paganiſm*; *Platonick* Philoſophy; and Divinity of the *Sybils*; or at leaſt out of compliance with ſuch new *Heathen* Converts: And then, that the more prudent and ſober *Fathers*, through timerouſneſs and deſpair of a reformation, have complied with the reſt, and been carried down with the ſtream. Thus *Zuinglius* † of S. *Auſtin*, touching *Corporal Preſence* (in which point many *Proteſtants* would have him their Patron) —— *Facile adducimur* (ſaith he) *Auguſtinum, præ aliis acuto, perſpicacique ingenio virum, ſua tempeſtate non fuiſſe auſum diſerte veritatem proloqui, quæ jam caſum magna parte dederat. Vidit omnino* † P. 376. † P. 376. † *De vera & falſa Religione.* p. 214.

§. 304.

nino pius Homo, quid hoc Sacramentum esset; & in quem usum esset institutum; verum invaluerat opinio de Corporea carne. And thus *Chemnitius* ‖ of the same Father, touching *Invocation of Saints*, *Hac Augustinus, sine Scriptura; temporibus & consuetudini cedens.* And *Bochart. Origin. de P. Invoc. p.* 488. ——— *St.* Austin (*who seems to have been of a disposition wonderfully sweet and courteous*) *suffers himself often to comply with the common errors, and superstitions, endeavouring rather to put a good sense upon them, than to cross them*, &c. And, ——— *Tantæ vir authoritatis in negotio Dei libere loqui non audebat.* ——— *Cum præsumptionibus omnia impleri videret, schismatis metu, aperte damnare non audebat*, saith *Vossius* †] Again, * saying, they held many things only as probabilities, which later times have advanced into matters of Faith, and that necessary. He finds them also, in *Appeal* to this *Antiquity*, ascending rather to the three first ages thereof; *ages* wherein the Church was persecuted; and few Records are left of her general Doctrines, or Practices; and more willingly declining the later; where the Records many; and the Church, in her flourishing condition, more fully displaying to the world all her Government and Discipline; these men confessing some appearances of several of the Tenents and Customs, they oppose, in the fourth age. Lastly, he finds them, apt to change the phrase, and language of the Ancients; and bogling at many of their terms [such as those of *Merit, Satisfaction, Altars, Priests, Sacrifices*, &c.] which novelty of words often argues a new conceit of things.

‖ *Exam. Con. Trid. 3. part. p.* 197.

† *Thes. de Invocat. S.*

This is the *Protestant*'s behaviour to *Antiquity* (in relating which, those who are versed in their books of Controversie, especially the writings of the *French*, know, that I falsifie nothing). Whereas on the other side, the opposite party to this, he finds usually defending those works of the *Fathers*, which the others question; and not discarding Records certainly ancient, because perhaps some of them mis-entitled as to the *Author*, and somewhat antedated as to the *Time*: Again stating their Theological questions, and extracting their Comments on Scripture controverted, out of their writings: Covering their defects: and charitably interpreting what, in them is any way capable thereof, and reconciling their seeming Contradictions: Lastly Sainting the *Fathers*, and solemnly commemorating them in their publick Service: Often urging, and laying much weight on ancient *Tradition*, and so keeping stable, and firm from generation to generation, the *Doctrine* and *Faith* of the *Church*, and, out of this Tradition, convincing *Heresies*: Defending the legal authority of those *Councils*, which the other oppose; and gathering their *Canons* into certain Heads for the standing Laws and Rules of present Church Government: Not looking back with such rigor and jealousie upon their supreme Judges, and examining their numbers, their Commissions, Elections, (if these free from *Simony*) Ordinations, nay Baptism: nor holding them of more virtue, authority, or illumination, as to the deciding of Controversies, or enlarging Creeds, in one age, than another; but, in all ages, alike necessary, alike assisted.

§. 305. 4. But, yet further; He may discover the pretence to the Fathers, that is made by this party of late, not to have been so much, in the beginning of the *Reformation*. See before, §. 104. and 128. in the times of the Council

cil of *Trent*, their plain refusing to be tried by the *Councils*, *Fathers*, *Church-Tradition*, but as these are first proved to have founded their Doctrine in the *Scriptures*.

See the two Heads thereof, *Luther* and *Calvin*, their plain dealing in this matter in the many Quotations cited out of them before, *Disc.* 3. §. 78. *n.* 3, *&c.* —— *Quanti errores* (saith *Luther* ‖) *in omnium Patrum scriptis inventi sunt? Quoties sibi ipsis pugnant? Quis est, qui non sapius scripturas torserit? &c.* And, *contra Regem Anglie* —— *Non ego quero* (saith he) *quid Ambrosius, Augustinus, Concilia, & usus saculorum, dicunt,* —— *Miranda est stultitia Satana, quæ iis me impugnat, quæ ego impugno.* And, *lib. de Ministris Eccl. instituend.* —— *Non habent Papistæ quod his opponent* [*i. e.* to his private sense, and exposition of Holy Scriptures] *nisi, Patres, Concilia, Consuetudinem.* [Is not that enough?] ‖ *In assertione Articul.*

Calvin, De Ecclesia reformanda ratione, c. 19. to the judgment of *Antiquity* urged against him in the point, *De Sacrificio & Missa*, returns such general answers as these, not unfrequent with him also concerning many other points. —— *Veterum sententias non moror, quas ad obruendam veritatem hic congerunt Moderatores. Solemne est nebulonibus istis* [you must pardon his heat, like that of *Luther*] *quicquid vitiosum in Patribus legitur, corradere.* And below. —— *Desinant boni Moderatores veterum sententiis pugnare, in mala causa.* Again, —— *Non est, quod vel Ambrosium, vel alium quempiam ex tota veterum cohorte, acutius vidisse putemus, quam ipsum Apostolum.* Again, —— *Ut millies clamant Papistæ, oblatum olim fuisse panem; veteres ita solitos facere, non novam esse consuetudinem; toties excipere nobis licebit: Christi mandatum inviolabilem esse regulam, quæ nulla hominum consuetudine, nulla præscriptione temporum, convelli, aut refigi debeat.* And, —— *Quod ad veteres spectat; non est quod, in eorum gratiam, ab æterna & inflexibili Dei veritate* [*i. e.* his own fancies concerning God's Truth] *recedamus.* And, concerning the ignorance or negligence of the *Fathers* in the main points of our Salvation, *Mans servitude under sin; Reconciliation to God; Justification, the effects* of Christ's *Death*, and *Intercessions*, thus he, in his answer to *Cassander's Offic. pii viri* ‖ —— *Si quid in controversiam vocetur, quia flexibile est τὸ ἐγγεγραμμον, instar nasi cerei, si absque Traditionis* [*i. e.* Patrum] *subsidio, quicquam definire fas non sit, Quid jam fiet præcipuis fidei nostræ capitibus? Tria solum exempli causa, proferam, 1. Naturæ nostræ corruptio, & misera animæ servitus sub peccati tyrannide; 2. Gratuita Justificatio; & 3. Christi sacerdotium, apud vetustissimos scriptores, ita obscure attingitur, ut nulla inde certitudo possit elici.* —— *Satan callide spinosis quæstionibus pios Doctores intricabat, ut negligentiores essent in hac parte; Quoniam vero errores, quibus profligandis tunc circumagebantur, magna ex parte sunt obsoleti, mediocrem duntaxat fructum percipimus ex eorum libris. Interea, si ex eorum Traditione hauriendæ sit cognitio salutis nostræ, jacebit omnis* fiducia: *quia ex illis nunquam discemus, quomodo Deo reconciliemur; quomodo illuminemur a Spiritu Sancto; & formemur in obsequium Justitiæ; quomodo gratis accepta nobis feratur Christi obedientia; quid valeat sacrificium mortis ejus, & continua pro nobis intercessio, &c.* The knowledge of such things (surely the chief principles of our salvation) not to be learnt out of the *Fathers*. And, that you may not think, ‖ *Apud Cassand. p.* 802.

think, that herein *Calvin*'s cenſure ſtands ſingle; before this man, *Melanchthon*, ſpeaking of *Luther*'s new diſcovery to the world of the Apoſtolical Doctrine in the very ſame points, in his *Preface* to the ſecond Tome of *Luther*'s works, thus pleaſeth himſelf in the rare invention thereof. *Eruditis* (ſaith he) *gratum erat, quaſi ex tenebris educi Chriſtum, Prophetas, Apoſtolos; conſpici diſcrimen Legis, & Evangelii, promiſſionum legis, & promiſſionis Evangelicæ: Quod certe non extabat in Thoma, Scoto, & ſimilibus* [This throws off the *Schoolmen*, the Diſciples of the *Fathers*]: But he ſtays not here; till he hath hunted up the ſame error, and miſtake, in theſe matters, in the *Fathers* too, as high as *Origen*'s time. —— *Origenica ætas* (ſaith he) *effudit hanc perſuaſionem; mediocrem rationis diſciplinam mereri remiſſionem peccatorum, &c.* And, —— *Hæc ætas pene amiſit totum diſcrimen Legis & Evangelii; & ſermonem Apoſtolicum dedidicit.* [Now, who, here, could have the boldneſs to embrace a *way* of *Juſtification* or Salvation, though pretended never ſo rational or ſcriptural; yet which is, withal confeſſed (if not alſo boaſted of) after ſo many ages of the Church, that it is a *New Diſcovery?*]

Deſcend we to others of the ſame, more free and open, times. *Peter* ‖ *Claſſ.4.c.4.* *Martyr*, in his *Common Places*, writing *De Patrum Authoritate* ‖ alledgeth, —— *Statim ab Apoſtolorum temporibus cepiſſe errores.* —— *Quum ergo volumus* (ſaith he) *inſtaurare Eccleſiam, nihil conſultius eſt, quam omma revocare ad prima eccleſiæ principia, & religionis primordia. Quamdiu enim conſiſtimus in Conciliis, & Patribus, verſabimur ſemper in iiſdem erroribus.* Again, —— *Quid fecerunt Antiquiſſimi illi ſcriptores, cum nulli adhuc eſſent Patres? Si tum eccleſia judicabant ex verbo, & ſpiritu, cur nunc quoque ita non poteſt judicare?* [which Queſtion is ſoon anſwered: that the Fathers *Fathers* were the *Apoſtles*; and that they judged *ex verbo, & ſpiritu, & Traditione Apoſtolorum*, for the ſenſe of the ſame Scriptures, where dubious.] Again, —— *Provocare a Scripturis* [he muſt mean, for what is the true ſenſe of Scripture] *ad Patres, eſt provocare a certis ad incerta, a claris ad obſcura, a firmis ad infirma,* —— *Et aliud, quod dixi, potiſſimum ſpectandum eſt; Patres non ſemper congruere inter ſe: & interdum, ne unum quidem ipſum convenire ſecum.* [Would any thus prejudice the Witneſſes he intends to bring into the Court for his own Cauſe?] Again, —— *Objiciunt nobis Paulum, in Ep. ad Tim. appellare eccleſiam Columnam veritatis. Sed non ſemper. Verum, quando nititur verbo Dei.* But, thus is the moſt ignorant perſon that can be named, *Columna veritatis.*] So *Peter Martyr*. Biſhop *Jewel*, our Countryman, (as the *Engliſh* Divines, who have departed leſs from *Antiquity* than other forain Proteſtant Churches, ſeem alſo more deſirous of being reputed to keep a fair correſpondence with it) in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth*'s days, in his challenge at *Paul*'s Croſs, propoſed no leſs than 27 Articles of Religion, wherein he offered to be tried by the *Fathers* of the firſt ſix hundred years: But then, it is very obſervable; that this learned man hath choſen them ſo warily, that of the twenty ſeven, twenty two are concerning the *Euchariſt*; and again, moſt of theſe, only about circumſtantials therein: and, in theſe concerning the *Euchariſt*, he omits, the *Oblation* of the *Euchariſt*, as a *Sacrifice*, to God the Father (only contends, *Art.* 17. no offering up, therein, of *Chriſt* unto

unto his Father): omits also the *reservation* of the *Eucharist*, after Communion ended. Omits also the most, if not all, the other principal points that are in Controversie: As *Invocation of Saints. Purgatory, and Prayer for the Dead. Veneration of sacred Relicks. Evangelical Counsels. Monastick Vows. Celibacy of the Clergy.* The *Roman* Doctrine concerning *Justification, Free-will and Merits*, concerning *Penances*, and *Satisfactions*. Concerning *Auricular Confession, Distinction* of *venial* and *mortal* sin, *&c.* His silence in which, arguing the *Fathers* not for, but against, Him, seems to have done much more *prejudice* to his cause, than his confident challenge for the other, hath done it *credit*. This thing Dr. *Cole*, then a Prisoner, observed; and in a Letter expostulated with him: *Quod minutiora attigerit, graviora prætermiserit*, †† who returned this answer, —— *Quæstiones se primum leviores moviisse, ut post ad alia dogmata veniretur: Alia* [*i. e.* the points he omitted] *esse ejusmodi, ad quæ probanda Conciliorum & Patrum authoritates quædam obtendi possint. Hæc, quæ ab ipso sunt posita,* —— *nullum colorem probabilitatis habere, &c.* And Dr. *Humphrey* (*Vita Juelli, p.* 212.) seems not very well pleased with this challenge of *Juel*'s, where he saith, —— *Quamvis Juellus non modo ad Scripturas, sed etiam ad tot annorum Centurias ad sextum usque sæculum, &c. provocavit.* —— *Tamen nimium largitus est, & vobis plus æquo concessit, & sibi nimium fuit injurius, quod rejecto medio,* [*i. e.* the Scriptures] *quo causam suam facilius & firmius sustentare potuisset, & seipsum, & ecclesiam quodammodo spoliavit.* —— *Satis enim erat Christiano, sic dixisse:* Sic dicit Dominus. *Satis erat, opposuisse*; Vestra dogmata Scripturis adversantur. *Siquidem Dæmoniacorum quæstio est:* Quid nobis, & tibi, Jesu, filii David? *At Sanctorum interrogatio est: Quid rei nobis cum Patribus, cum carne aut sanguine? Aut quid ad nos attinet, quod Episcoporum pseudo-Synodi constituunt? &c.*

†† See Dr. *Humphry. Vita Juelli.* p. 132.

In those more confident times also, the *Centurists* freely set down in the several ages the *errors* of the *Fathers*, which, in the modern Controversies, misled the latter *Roman*, and *Greek* Churches. *Hospinian* in the Preface to his *Histor. Sacrament.* to *Antiquity* urged as opposing the new reformed opinions, and practices, returns for answer, * the command in the Prophet *Jeremy.* —— *In statutis Patrum vestrorum nolite ambulare:* And * that saying of our Lord, —— *Sine causa colunt me, mandata & doctrinas hominum docentes*; and * that of St. *Cyprian*, —— *Consuetudo, sine veritate, vetustas erroris est*; and of St. *Austin*, —— *Antiquitatem præjudicare veritati nec posse, nec debere.* The forementioned *Dudithius* in his discontented Epistle to *Beza.* †† —— *Si veritas est*, (saith he) *quam veteres Patres mutuo consensu sunt professi, ea a Pontificiis tota stabit.*

§. 306. ——

†† See *Beza Epist.* 1.

And several later *Protestants* and other Dissenters from the Church of *Rome*, there are, who have been ingenuous in the same confession. *Grotius* in the beginning of his *Votum pro Pace*, giving an account of his reading of the *Fathers:* —— *Collegi* (saith he) *quæ essent illa, quæ veterum testimonio, & manentibus in hunc diem vestigiis, semper & ubique, & perseverantur, essent tradita; videbam ea manere in illa ecclesia, quæ Romana connectitur.*

§. 307. ——

Is. Casaubon (cited by *Arnauld*, in his late answer to *Claude* an *Hugenot* Minister, with many others, which you may view in his 1 *Book*, 5 *chap.*) in his Epistle to *Witenbogard*, † written 1610, a little before his coming into *England*, when he seems to have been in some greater disettlement, speaks thus. *Deum toto affectu veneror, ut mala ecclesiæ suæ qui potest solus velit, sanare. Me, ne quid dissimulem, hæc tanta diversitas* (in Protestants) *a fide veteris ecclesiæ non parum turbat. Ne de aliis dicam, in re sacramentorum a majoribus discessit Lutherus, &c.* Then †speaking of *Peter du Moulin* his making (as other *Protestants* usually do) those Tracts of the *Fathers*, that are urged to confirm the *Roman* Doctrine, spurious and counterfeit, As S. *Ambrose de sacramentis*, —— *Cyril Hierosol. Cateches. Mystagog.* —— *Gregory Nyssen*'s Catechetical Oration, he thus goes on, —— *Jam, quod idem Molinæus omnes veterum libros suæ doctrinæ contrarios respuit, ut ὑποβολιμαίους cui mediocriter docto fidem faciet? Falsus illi Cyrillus Hierosolymitanus, falsus Gr. Nyssenus, falsus Ambrosius, falsi omnes: mihi liquet falli ipsum; & illa scripta esse verissima, quæ ipse pronunciat Ψευδεπίγραφα.* Thus *Casaubon*.

† *Præstantium Virorum Epistolæ.*

†. §. 297.

§. 308. More general yet is that confession of *Socinus*, *Ep. ad Radecium*. *Legantur* (saith he) *Pontificiorum scripta adversus Lutheranos, & Calvinianos & satis intelliget, si præter sacras literas, illorum* [*Patrum*, produced by the *Pontificii*] *authoritati sit standum, nobis omnino causa cadendum esse.* And indeed the followers of *Socinus*, despairing as to their chief points concerning God's Attributes, and the Trinity, to produce any just plea from ancient Church-Authority, do also, more candidly, relinquish this interest as to those other Controversies, which they, in common with other reformed, maintain against *Catholicks*. In defending which points, when the *Fathers* are urged against them, their ordinary answer is: 1. That Error and *Antichrist* came into the Church so soon as the Apostles by death went out of it: And therefore they make even the *Apostles* themselves, not the *Roman* Empire, (for that, they say, would keep out *Antichrist* too long) to be the ὁ κατέχων 2 *Thess.* 2. 2. That the *Fathers* would have the Holy Scriptures to be believed, rather than any thing they say. 3. That the *Fathers* are not to be believed in any thing they say contrary to the *Scriptures*: and that, if *Antiquity* be to be followed, the *Prophets* and *Apostles* are the most ancient; [these persons, impudently, calling by the *name* of Prophets, Apostles, Scriptures, that private sense they impose upon them]. See for this *Volkelius de vera Relig. l.* 3. *c.* 40. —— and *l.* 4. *c.* 22. and frequently elsewhere; and see *Beza*, in his first Epistle, applying like plaisters to the wound of *Dudithius*.

§. 309. *Chillingworth* also, more candidly than many of his followers, in his new *Socinian* way, that all *necessaries*, to all manner of persons using their industry, are *clear* in the *Holy Scriptures*, seems very little solicitous in engaging the *Fathers*, or other *Antiquity*, on his side, by reason of the evidence, in Holy Scriptures, of all *necessaries*; and the needlessness of deciding any *non-necessaries*. —— *I for my part* [saith he in the latter end of his work, after his declaring, not the Articles of the Church of *England*, not the harmony of *Protestant* Confessions; but the *Bible*, the *Bible*, to be his Religion] *after a long*

a long, (and as I verily believe and hope) impartial search of the true way to eternal happiness, do profess plainly, that I cannot find any rest for the sole of my foot, but upon this Rock only [*i. e.* of the *Bible*, not, of the *Church*; for as for this latter he goes on] —— *I see plainly, and with my own eyes; that there are Popes against Popes, Councils against Councils, some Fathers against others, the same Fathers against themselves, a consent of Fathers of one age against a consent of Fathers of another age, the Church of one age against the Church of another age, Traditive Interpretations of Scripture, few or none found,* —— *no sufficient certainty, but of Scripture only,* [not any it seems of *Antiquity*, or of the *Primitive Church*: yet, out of which the *Catholicks* always convinced *Heresies*] *for any considering man to build upon.* Thus he, down-right.

And therefore it is considerable; That, in his answers to the *Motives* of his turning *Catholick* † (that you may see the Authority of *Antiquity*, and of *Church-Tradition*, had a great hand in leading him to *Popery*, but none at all in reducing to *Protestantism*) he is not sollicitous at all to deny, or disprove, the truth of these *motives*; but to traverse the consequence he formerly made from them. So, to the first Motive to the *Roman Catholick* Religion: *viz.* —— *That a perpetual visible Profession is apparently wanting to Protestant Religion, so far as concerns the points in contestation.* He answers, not, by denying any such visible Profession to be wanting to Protestants; But, that any such visible Profession, without any mixture of falshood, is not necessary. Again, to the Fourth: —— *That many Points of Protestant Doctrine are the opinions of Hereticks, condemned by the Primitive Church.* He answers, not, by denying the *Protestant* Doctrines to be condemned as *Heretical*, by the *Primitive Church*; But, that those in the *Primitive Church* condemned many doctrines as such; that were not so. To the Sixth, —— *That the Doctrine of the Church of* Rome *is conformable, and the doctrine of Protestants contrary, to the doctrine of the Fathers, who lived in the first 600 years, even by the confession of Protestants themselves.* He answers, not, by denying this; but by retortion of the like to the *Roman* Church: —— *That the Doctrine of Papists is confest by the Papists, contrary to the Fathers, in many points.* But here he tells not, in what points. And, had he, I suppose it would either have been in some points not controverted with Protestants; As perhaps about the *Millennium: Communicating of Infants*, or the like; or else, in some circumstances, only of some point controverted. To the Tenth, —— *That Protestants, by denying all humane Authority either of Pope or Councils, or Church, to determine controversies of Faith, have abolished all possible means of suppressing Heresie, or restoring unity to the Church:* He answers, not, by denying *Protestants* to reject all humane Authority, *Pope*, *Councils*, or *Church*: But by maintaining, that *Protestants*, in having the *Scriptures* only, and endeavouring to believe them in the true sense, have no need of any such authority for determining matters of Faith; nor, can be *Hereticks*; and do take the only way for reflouring unity. In all which, you see Church-authority and ancient Tradition led on the man to be a *Catholick*; and the rejecting this authority, and betaking himself to a private interpretation and understanding of the Scriptures,

§. 310. † *See the conclusion of his Preface,* §. 41, *&c.*

and endeavouring to believe them in their true ſenſe, reduced him to *Proteſtantiſm*. He mean-while not conſidering, how any can be ſaid to uſe a *right endeavour* to believe *Scripture* in the true *ſenſe*; or to ſecure himſelf from *Hereſie*; or to conſerve *unity* * who refuſeth, herein, to obey the direction of thoſe ſpiritual Superiors, paſt, preſent, *Fathers*, *Councils*, *Biſhops*, whom our Lord hath appointed to guide and inſtruct his Church in the true ſenſe of Scriptures, as to matter of Faith, *Ut non, fluctuantes, circumferamur omni vento doctrinæ, &c. Eph.* 4. 14. Again, * who refuſeth to continue in the *Confeſſion* of the *Faith* of theſe Guides, ſo to eſcape *Hereſies*; and, to continue in their *Communion*, ſo to enjoy the *Catholick unity*. And what *Hereſie* at all is it here that Mr. *Chillingworth* ſuppreſſeth? which none can incur, that is verily perſwaded, that ſenſe, he takes Scripture in, to be the right; and what *Heretick* is not ſo perſwaded? For profeſſing any thing againſt ones Conſcience, or Judgment, or againſt what he thinks is the ſenſe of Scripture, is not *Hereſie*, but *Hypocriſie*. And what new unity is this that Mr. *Chillingworth* entertains? That none can want, who will but admit all to his communion (whatever tenents they are of) that, to this Interrogatory, *whether they do endeavour to believe Scripture in a true ſenſe?* will anſwer affirmatively. † But this is beſide my preſent purpoſe; and his Principles have been already diſcuſſed at large in *Diſc.* 2. §. 38, *&c.* So much of Mr. *Chillingworth*.

† See *his Preface*, §. 43. *parag. To the* 10*th*.

By theſe Inſtances the diſintereſſed will eaſily diſcern, what way he is to take, if he will commit his ignorance, or diſſatisfaction in Controverſies, to the guidance of *Antiquity*, or *Church-Authority* paſt, when he ſees ſo many of the *Reformed* in the beginning, but alſo ſeveral of late, deſerting as it were their Title to it (excepting the times Apoſtolical) as not defendable.

§. 311.

5. Laſtly, In all this he will be the more confirmed, when he obſerves, that theſe men, inſtead of embracing, and ſubmitting to, the Doctrines and Traditions of former Church-Doctrine, fly, in the laſt place, to that deſperate ſhift of the early appearance of *Antichriſt* in the world; who alſo (as they ſay) muſt needs be comprehended within the Body of the Church, and be a profeſſor of *Chriſtianity*; nay, muſt be the very chief Guides, and *Patriarchs* thereof; and theſe, as high as the Fourth, or Fifth age; nay much ſooner, (ſay ſome) even upon the *Exit* of the Apoſtles. A conceit, which, armed, with the Texts, 1 John 2. 12. [*little children, as ye have heard, that Antichriſt ſhall come, ſo are there even now many Antichriſts*] —— and c. 4. v. 3. —— [*This is the ſpirit of Antichriſt, whereof you have heard, that it ſhould come; and even now already is it in the world,*] arm'd, I ſay, with theſe Texts miſapplied to the perſons, whom they think fit to diſcredit, at one blow cuts off the Head of all *Church-Authority*, *Tradition*, *Fathers*, *Councils*, how ancient ſoever: And the main Artifice this was, whereby *Luther* made his new Doctrine to ſpread abroad and take root; when he had, thus, firſt taken away all reverence to former Church, and its conſtant Doctrines and Traditions, as this Church having been, for ſo long a time, the very *ſeat of Antichriſt*, *Babylon*, *the great Whore*, and I know not what. And after this *ground-work* laid; now, ſo much in Antiquity as any *Proteſtant* diſlikes, pre-

preſently appears to him under the ſhape of Antichriſtian Apoſtaſie: And in his reſiſting, and oppoſing the Church, he quiets his Conſcience herewith; and ſeems to himſelf, not a Rebel againſt his ſpiritual Governors, but a Champion againſt *Antichriſt*. But on theſe terms, if they would well conſider it, our Lord's promiſes to the Church, that it ſhould be ſo firmly built on the Rock, as that the Gates of Hell ſhould never prevail againſt it, and the Apoſtle's Prediction, that it ſhould always be a Pillar and Ground of Truth, are utterly defeated, and have miſcarried, in its very infancy. For how can theſe Gates of Hell more prevail, than, that the chief Guides and Governors of this Church, ſignified by the falſe Prophet, *Apoc.* 13. 11, *&c.* with great *ſignes* and *miracles*, ſhall ſet up *Satans Kingdom*, and Standard in the *midſt* of it, ſhall practiſe a manifold *Idolatry* within it; and corrupt the *Nations* with their falſe Doctrines; and laſtly, maintain this kingdom of Satan (thus ſet up, I ſay, not without, or againſt, but within the bowels of, the Church) now, by the ordinary computation of *Proteſtants*, for above Twelve hundred years; whilſt the *Emperor*, and other *Roman Catholick Princes* are imagined during all this time to be the *Beaſt*, or Secular State, *that opens its mouth in Blaſphemy againſt God*; and *makes war with the Saints*. † To whoſe Religion this falſe Prophet gives life, *Apoc.* 13. 11, 15. Both which, this *Beaſt* and this *Falſe Prophet*, for their Idolatry and Oppreſſion, at the appointed time (before this expected; now, they ſay, not far off;) ſhall be caſt into the *Lake* or pool of *Fire*. For ſo their doom runs, Apoc. 19. 20. —— *And the Beaſt was taken and the Falſe Prophet,* —— *and both theſe were caſt alive into a lake of fire.* † *Apoc.* 13. 6, 7.

§. 312. And this, ſo great, and miſchievous, an error, becomes in them much the leſs excuſable, ſince the latter world hath ſeen the appearance of the great *Falſe Prophet Mahomet* upon the ſtage: and ſince they might eaſily diſcern, all the *phænomena*, or Characters of the *Apocalyptical Falſe Prophet*, which are by them, through inſuperable difficulties, miſapplied to the *Pope*, the Head of the Church, to have been moſt viſibly and eminently fulfilled in Him. * Who is the Head and Founder of that *Falſe Religion*, which hath ſo boldly invaded *Chriſtianity*, after ſo many hundred years growth; and ſupplanted it in the greateſt and moſt dignified part of the converted world. * Whoſe *ſigns* and *wonders*, how lying or ridiculous ſoever (for God forbid, any ſuch ſhould be expected from this falſe Prophet, as our Lord, or his Apoſtles did) have had the very ſame effect, as the two Apoſtles † have foretold thoſe of the *falſe Prophet* ſhould have, *viz.* the *ſeduction*, and deluſion of the *Nations*; and if there be no wonder in the *wonders*, the greater wonder there is in the *ſeduction*, that followed upon them. * Who hath introduced a new Goſpel, and that pretended to have been written in Heaven, he aſſuming therein the perſon and voice of God; new Sacraments; new days, and places, of ſolemn worſhip; who hath moulded a new, fine, eaſie Religion, void (as his faith) of all *Controverſies* and ſubtilties; and conſiſting only of one Article of Faith [*One only God, and* Mahomet *his Prophet*]: Deviſed new pleaſing laws, which (that they might be point-blanck oppoſite to our Lords) are full of luſt and uncleanneſs on one ſide, and of cruelty, rapine, tyranny, violence, the ſword, † *Apoc.* 13. 13, 14. --- 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 9, 10.

ſlavery,

slavery, and the law martial, on another: and hath invented new future sensual-Beatitudes suitable to the observance of his laws. * Who hath changed *Dies Dominica*, for solemn worship, into *Dies Veneris*; and the visiting of our Lord's Sepulchre and Temple at *Jerusalem*, to his at *Mecha*; Subjecting *Sarah* to *Hagar*, and *Isaac* to *Ismael*. * Who hath taken away the Christian Altars, and the daily Evangelical Sacrifice, the Sacraments, the Priests, and thrown out of the Churches the Bodies of the Saints, interred there, as contaminating them.

§. 313. * Who, after the attempts of *Cerinthus*, *Carpocrates*, and others in S. *John*'s days, and the progress of *Arius*, and his Disciples, in following ages (almost all the ancient Hereticks being treacherous to our Lord's Divinity) hath at last compleated that which is spoken of 1 *John* 4. 2. * the *Dissolution of Jesus* [as the *Vulgar*, and those *Greek* Copies it follows, have it, †See *Socrat. Hist. l.* 7. *c.* 32.---*Irenaeus. l.* 3. *c.* 18. ὁ καταλύει τὸν Ἰησοῦν, †] or * the denial of *Jesus* his coming *in the flesh* (as other Copies) *i. e.* his *descending* from Heaven *into* the *flesh*; whilst he hath rob'd our Lord not only of his *Divinity*, but also, by this, of the High Prerogatives of his *Humanity* too; rob'd him also of his *Cross* and *Death* (which he saith he never suffered) and so rob'd Him and the world of his *Satisfactions* and *Merits*; and all the vertue of the Sacraments relating thereto; and hath challenged the Honour, of being the *last Prophet*, sent from God, *Apoc.* 13. 2. unto himself. * In whom the *Dragon* seems to have shewed his *greatest*, and *last*, Art; (after the world was somewhat well acquainted with his former snares). For, whereas heretofore he thrust all the world into *Idolatry*, now, out of the envy which Satan bears to the *Honour* given by the Church to the glorified *Saints*, his Disciple and Champion, this *false Prophet*, becomes *a professed enemy* to all former *Idolatry*; and much displeased he is with *Christianity* upon this account. And again, out of the envy Satan bears to the *Divinity* of our Lord, a great zealot this his *false Prophet* is for the worship of *one only God*; that (saith he) hath neither *Wife*, nor *Child*. Yet who, in opposing and denying the *Divinity* of our Lord *Jesus*, the *Son*, hath lost, and depriv'd himself of, *God the Father* too, in St. *John*'s consequence; For, in opposition to Antichrist, the Apostle saith, Ephes. 2. 9. ——— *That he who abideth in the doctrine of Christ, hath the Father and the Son:* And, 1 Joh. 2. 23. ——— *That he who denieth the Son* [*i. e.* that Jesus is the Son; or (ver. 22.) *that Jesus is the Christ*, or, 1 Joh. 4. 3. ——— *that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh*] *i. e.* come from Heaven, or from God, into the *flesh*, all which this false Prophet expressly opposeth;] *He that*, thus, *denies the Son, the same* [also] *hath not the Father*, saith the Apostle. And so this *man of sin* retains

§. 314. no title either to *God* the *Son*, or *God* the *Father*; either to the God of *Christians*, or to the *Heathen* Gods; whom also he hath cast off.

Apoc. 12. 6, 14. 2 *Thess.* 2. 4. *Apoc.* 13. 3, 12, 13. *Apoc.* 13. 3, 4. * Who hath planted himself in all the primitively famous Churches, to whom our Lord or his Apostles directed their Epistles (except one, where the Woman cloathed with the Sun hath hitherto had a place provided for her) and, amongst others, in God's Temple at *Jerusalem*, from the possession of which no Christian Heroical attempts have been able hitherto, finally to expel him. * Who, possessing all the middle of the Earth, and having thrust

thruſt up the Church as it were into a corner, and the outer skirts, thereof, the Iſlands of the *Weſt*, hath erected a new dreadful Empire; and reviv'd the *Image* of the former *Heathen* State, that perſecuted the Church in the beginning, and which long ſince ſeemed to have received its mortal wound; which he hath wonderfully cured: And ſeated this his Empire in the very ſame place, and turned the *Sancta Sophia*, heretofore the glory of *Chriſtian* Churches, into a *Moſche*. * Whoſe miraculous conqueſts have made the world to wonder after him, and to adore him, ſaying, who is like to him? who, able to make war with him? *Apoc.* 13. 3, 4. * With whoſe perſecution no former can be compared, either for duration of time, or (by his facile, and ſenſual, Religion) ſlaughter of ſouls. * Who alſo hath afflicted *Chriſtianity* now for above a thouſand of the *Proteſtants* twelve hundred and ſixty Days || taken for Years: and near upon the ſame time (that they may ſee their numbers alſo fit Him) as, they ſay, the *Pope* hath oppreſſed it. [Only, the Antiquity of the Church's *pretended* Idolatry, ſaid to be about, or before, *A. D.* 400. † forceth them to begin their account of the *Pope's Apoſtaſie*, and oppreſſion of the Faith, ſo early, as, juſtly computed, according to the twelve hundred and ſixty days, *i. e.* years of his duration, it happens to be already expired, yet expired without any alteration of affairs obſerved at this time, correſpondent to the Propheſie of Antichriſt's deſtruction, and the Church's exaltation after ſuch term expired; (for that change at the *Reformation*, a great one indeed, on the other ſide, comes too early) whereas the ſame account, of twelve hundred and ſixty years, applied to the *Mahometan Apoſtaſie*, being of two hundred years later date, ſuffers, as yet, no contradiction from the event.]

|| *Apoc.* 12. 6, 14.---13. 5.---11. 3. *Dan.* 7. 25. ---12. 7.

† *Mede, Apoſtaſie of latter times. c.* 14. Dr. *More Synopſ. Prophet. c.* 7. *n.* 7. *Apolog. p.* 552.

* Who, by all theſe things, by abrogating the Laws, and Worſhip not only of all the former *Heathen Gods*, but alſo of the *Chriſtians*, and the true, God; and, inſtead thereof, ſetting up his own, 2. Theſſ. 2. 4. *hath oppoſed*, and *exalted himſelf above*, *all that is called God*; and *ſhewed himſelf*, *as though he were God:* If we may underſtand theſe expreſſions of the *Apoſtle*, concerning this later enemy of God, and his Church, as we do thoſe of the *Prophets* (whence they were borrowed) concerning thoſe ancient ones: the King of *Babylon*, and the King of *Tyre*, and *Antiochus Epiphanes*, of whom like things are ſpoken there. Of the King of *Babylon* thus the Prophet *Eſay* † ——— *Thou didſt ſay in thine heart: I will aſcend into Heaven, above the Stars of God, will I exalt my throne: I will ſit in the Mount of the Teſtament* [the Temple] *I will aſcend above the height of the clouds, and be like to the Higheſt.* Of the King of *Tyre* thus the Prophet *Ezekiel.* † ——— *Thou haſt ſaid, I am God; and have ſitten in the chair of God*, &c. and, verſ. 6. ——— *Thy heart is elevated, as the heart of God.* And of *Antiochus* thus the Prophet *Daniel.* † ——— *That he ſhould elevate and magnifie himſelf againſt every God; and againſt the God of Gods ſpeak magnificent things,* ——— *That the God of his Fathers he ſhould not account of, neither care for any of the Gods.* Yet, in the fulfilling of theſe Prophecies; their exaltations and blaſphemies (who ſtill had ſome Deity whom they externally profeſſed to adore,) their Empires, and Tyrannies over the Saints, are no way comparable to thoſe

§. 315.

† *c.* 14. 13, 14.

† *c.* 28. 2.

† 11. 36, 37.

thoſe of the preſent *Mahometan* Empire; and this Son of *Iſmael*'s preſuming
|| *Rom.* 9. 6. to exalt himſelf above the Son of God; Chriſt our Lord, || *who is over all things, God bleſſed for ever.* Laſtly, * who hath effected all his Projects with the greater ſucceſs, and leſs diſturbance or jealouſie of Chriſtians, becauſe one part of them, out of a particular intereſt, and inteſtine quarrels, miſapply the Prophecies to another Perſon; Another part, from the *high* expreſſions of them, (which are uſually very *Hyperbolical*) expect yet greater matters, than have been diſcovered in him, or probably ſhall be in any other.

However, I think, He, that ſoberly weighs the things ſaid before, will ſee, what little reaſon *Proteſtants* have to arraign, and condemn, the *Biſhop of Rome*; the chief *Paſtor* of Chriſts Flock, for this great *falſe Prophet*; and mean while to abſolve, and diſmiſs this *Barabbas*: To whom the New-Teſtament Propheſies ſeem to agree with much exactneſs, but no way to ſute to the other.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVI.

Of the pretence of Certainty, against Church-Authority.

Reply to the 2d *Defence,* *The pretended Certainty of a Truth, against* Church-Authority, §. 318.

1. *That it is a very difficult thing to arrive to a rational, and demonstrative certainty, in matters intellectual; more, in matters Divine, and Spiritual; and especially, in such Divine matters, where* Church-Authority *delivers the contrary for a certain Truth,* Ibid.

Instances made in four principal points of modern Controversie: For which Church-Authority *is, by many* Protestants, *charged with Idolatry, and Sacriledge,* §. 320.

1. *The* Corporal Presence, *and consequently* Adoration, *of Christ's Body and Blood in the* Eucharist, §. 321.

A Digression, *Concerning the Opinion of the* Greek *and other Oriental Churches: Their holding a* Real Presence *of our Lord's Body and Blood in the* Eucharist *(whether by* Transubstantiation, *or not) misrepresented by M.* Claude *a* French *Minister.*

2. Invocation *of* Saints, §. 322.
3. Veneration *of* Images, §. 323.
4. Communion in one kind, §. 324.

2. *That such Certainty, if in a Truth of small importance, though it cannot yield an obedience of Assent to* Church-Authority, *yet stands obliged still to an obedience of* silence, §. 330.

Conceded by Protestants, §. 331.

3. *That such Certainty of a Truth never so important, and necessary (where also one is to be certain, that it is so) though it be supposed free from the obedience, of* Assent; *and of* Silence; *yet stands obliged to a Third, a* passive *obedience, to* Church-Authority, *a peaceable undergoing the Church's* Censures (*though this be the heaviest,* Excommunication; *and that unjust;*) *without erecting, or joyning to any other external Communion, divided from it. Which third obedience only yielded, preserves the Church from schism,* §. 332, 333.

I Have spoken hitherto of the first of the two Guards (mentioned before, §. 270.) which *Protestants* use, to defeat obedience to the *Council* of *Trent*, or any other, though proved never so *legal*, or *supreme*; *viz.* the *Obligation* to follow their *Conscience* against any humane Authority, even though this Conscience be *erroneous*. To which hath been replied: That, such *obligation* granted, yet there is no general security to any one in this practice; because of another obligation precedent to this: namely, his duty, first, rightly to *inform* his *Conscience*; so that, whensoever the §. 316.

firſt is neglected, the latter excuſeth not. And then: For the rectifying this *information* of *Conſcience*, which requires our greateſt care, I have ſet down, (§. 274, 275, 277.) the three common deceits, the intereſted Will uſeth to corrupt, or miſguide the Conſcience, or Judgment, as it pleaſeth; namely, 1. Either by hindring the Judgment from any ſearch of ſuch matters of Religion, and wholy diverting it to other employments, whereby it may become more pliable to any impreſſion, in theſe ſpiritual matters, which ſecular intereſt recommends: 2. Or, by indulging a ſearch into ſuch matters, but this pre-engaged, and confined to a *Party*: 3. Or, by admitting an impartial ſearch into all ſides: But this, only as to arguments drawn from *ſeeming-Reaſon*; be not, as to thoſe other, drawn from the juſt weight of *preſent*, or *paſt*, *Church-Authority*. All which Arts and Deceits, of the Will, have been ſeriouſly reflected on, and cenſured (the firſt in, §. 281, *&c.* The ſecond, §. 289, *&c.* The third, §. 291, *&c.*) And ſo, a well-informed Conſcience, reduced to *obedience* of *Church-Authority*, in all ſpiritual matters, at leaſt, ſuch, or ſo many, wherein it acknowledgeth no abſolute *Certainty* of its own opinions.

§. 317. Now, of the ſecond *Guard*, or Defence, (mentioned before, §. 271.) againſt *obedience* to a legal *Church-Authority*; (uſed by thoſe *Proteſtants*, who ſee the weak plea of a *miſinformed* conſcience, which every *groſs error* makes uſe of; and who ſeem more reſpectful, and wary, to preſerve their duty to their ſpiritual Superiors) *viz.* Where perſons have a *Certainty*, that ſuch *Church-Authority* manifeſtly errs. Which *certainty* they ſay, any one may preſume of ſo often, as he can demonſtrate the contrary of what is maintained by this *Authority*. The trial of which *Demonſtration* alſo, whether it be a true one, they ſay, is thus certainly diſcovered, if ſo many others, as hear it, and underſtand the terms, are alſo ſatisfied and convinced by it (for ſuch a fence againſt falſe *Demonſtrations*, the more judicious *Proteſtants* have made againſt the *Puritans*, and thoſe, who have pretended manifeſt and demonſtrable errors in, and ſo refuſed obedience to their own *Provincial*, or *National Synods*).

§. 318. In anſwer to this ſecond Defence. Firſt: It may be noted here: That all perſons *not certain* are, by this plea, left to *Church-Obedience*. Secondly,

* 1. Theſe things, concerning *Certainty*, ſhall freely be granted unto them: 1. That, who is certain of any thing, neither ought, nor indeed poſſibly can, yield the obedience of *Aſſent* to any *Authority* whatever, propoſing the contrary; nor may profeſs to yield it; for this is lying, and acting againſt Conſcience: 2. And again; That to one liable to error in ſome things, yet ſome other things may well be ſo plain, and manifeſt, that he may have abundant certainty thereof. And: 3. That ſuch a *Demonſtration* of his *Certainty*, as, propoſed to any that underſtands the terms, ſatisfieth and convinceth him, is good. But, theſe granted, yet a Judgment, well purged from Secular Intereſt, will here alſo conſider:

1. That it is no ſuch eaſie matter, as it is thought, to arrive at *certainty* in things intellectual, where our ſenſes do not aſſiſt us; and eſpecially thoſe, that are Divine, and Spiritual; * where, theſe things not being collected by Reaſon,

Reaſon, but originally delivered to us by Divine Revelation, both the matters are, many times, very *myſterious*, treating of the perfections, wiſdom, and ways of God: His Divine Laws, and Sacraments; things above our *natural* reach; and the words alſo, ſignifying theſe to us, are many times not free from *ſeveral acceptations*, literal, and figurative (elſe all perſons would agree in the ſame ſenſe), ſo that apparent contradiction in the words, by diſtinguiſhing of ſome term, is none in the ſenſe, but both the verbal Contradictions very true; * Where again, theſe Revelations being many, and all moſt certainly true, none may be taken in ſuch a ſenſe, as to contradict *any* other; And laſtly, * where, the true *eſſence* of things, abſtracted from all their *Accidents*, (which accidents again cannot be known to us to be ſo, but by an *actual ſeparation*) being not perfectly known to us, hence alſo though it be moſt certain to us that two contradictions cannot be true, yet it is moſt difficult to diſcern, what things truly contradict. For it is a Contradiction only, when the ſame thing is denied of, or removed from it ſelf. As this [a man is not a man.] Or this [A man is white, or not white] where the formal Contradiction, being reſolved, is [whiteneſs is not whiteneſs: Manhood is not Manhood]. And it is no contradiction, but truth, when ever a thing is denied of any thing not in it ſelf. Therefore this, what is, or is not, the thing it ſelf; or, its eſſence; muſt exactly be known, before a true and real contradiction be ſo. And this difficulty, which is indeed in all nature, muſt ſtill be the greater in theſe things *ſpiritual*, and more remote from ſenſe; of which we are ſpeaking. —— *Cum res tanta ſit* (ſaith S. *Auſtin* †) *ut Deus tibi ratione cognoſcendus ſit, omneſne putas idoneos, &c?* And, *Tu in eos libros, qui ſancti, Divinarumque rerum pleni, &c. ſine Duce intuis?* And, —— *Nihil eſt facilius, quam, non ſolum ſe dicere, ſed etiam opinari, verum inveniſſe; ſed hoc reipſa difficillimum eſt.* And therefore, in that excellent Treatiſe, † he adviſeth them firſt, laying aſide ſuch fancies of certainty to believe the *Church*. —— *Quo illuminaturo præparentur Deo.*] And, indeed, who is there, if he reflect upon the many ſeeming certainties, that he hath had in ſome opinions, afterward forſaken, that will not perceive, that this conceited certainty is an ordinary fallacy, which thoſe, who know leaſt, and ſo have leaſt reaſon to think themſelves certain, are moſt ſubject to. —— *Qui ad pauca reſpicit, facile pronunciat.*

† See *before*, §. 293.

† *De utilitate Credendi.*

But then further: If in thoſe things Divine, this particular point, wherein we pretend a certainty, be ſuch, as that the ſupremeſt *Church-Authority* propoſeth to us the contrary as certain, an Authority (not to mention here the ſupernatural aſſiſtance promiſed them) of the ſame, or better abilities, than we, for their intellectuals; and that hath all the ſame external means, and Grounds, of the knowledge of ſuch point as we, perhaps more; to whom alſo all the Grounds, Motives, Arguments of our certainty of it have been communicated; perſons likewiſe (we ought to preſume) of as much diligence in ſearching truth, as much integrity, and freedom from paſſion, and intereſt, as our ſelves; For, theſe judge for *themſelves* as well as for their *Subjects*; and ſet down their own, as well as preſcribe another's, *faith*; this, I ſay, will make any ſuch conceited *certainty* on our ſide, yet much more irrational. §. 319.

irrational. (See more said of this in the 4th *Disc.* §. 11.) And lastly, besides all this, our pretended *Demonstrations*, being put to the trial according to the former *Protestant*-Definition of a *demonstration*, will prove constantly false, as from which so many rational and learned persons, hearing or reading them, continue to dissent. Neither here will the plea, of the *perspicuity* and clearness of the *Scriptures* in such point (ordinarily the chief pretence we have for our certainty) any way relieve us, or release our *obedience* to these *Governours*, but rather promote it. Because, if these *Scriptures* be to us clear, so will they be to them: Or, if these *Scriptures*, like the Israelites Cloud, be light to one, and darkness to another, our humility ought to believe, that the light side of it will be rather toward the Church-Governors, than toward us, when singular, and differing from them; who also are appointed to enlighten us ‖.

‖ *Mat.* 5.14.

§. 320. The four main points, that are maintained by the supreme *Church-Authority*, to which *Protestants* refuse conformity, and at which they take most offence, and for which many of them charge the Church of *Rome* with *Idolatry* and *Sacriledge*, are, 1. The *Corporal Presence* of Christ's *Body* and *Blood* in the *Eucharist*, and consequently *Adoration* of them, as present. 2. *Worship and Invocation of Saints.* 3. *Veneration of Images.* 4. *Communion in one kind.* As for a *fifth*, which might be added: The *language*, that ought to be used, according to several Nations, in the Celebration of the *publick Service* of God, I here omit it: Supposing this might be easily so accommodated, as, *solely*, to be no hinderance of an *union*, where all the other real Controversies are accorded between the two Churches.

§. 321. *n.* 1. For the First, then, of these four points, *the Corporal Presence of our Lord in the Eucharist*, from which follows *Adoration:* Since, as hath been shewed in the first Discourse, §. 62. and more copiously in the Historical *Discourse* of the *Eucharist*, §. 35. a possibility thereof is not opposed by many of the *Reformed*; and the *true sense* of *Hoc est Corpus meum*, and of other *Scriptures*, whether *de facto*, these do declare it so present, is that, by which this Question, between the two Parties must be decided; I see not what *Demonstrative certainty*, any *Protestant* can rationally pretend, of the sense he gives to these Scriptures in opposition to that other sense of them, which is maintained by *Church-Authority*; and hath been, by so many Councils; expreslly declared (long before *Protestancy* was thought on); Of which Councils, see 1 *Disc.* 57, &c. and this, after so long, and subtile disputes for about three hundred years; *viz.* from the 2*d. Nicen* Council to the days of *Berengarius*; and after so diligent an Examination (on both sides) of *Primitive Tradition*, by *Paschasius*, *Bertram*, and others, Eight hundred years ago; and, since that, *Lanfrank*, *Guitmund*, &c. at the appearance of *Berengarius*. Which *Primitive Tradition*, and judgment of *Antiquity*, that it was, if this may not be taken on the credit of so many *Councils*, the same concerning these Scriptures, with that of the *present* Church-Authority, I think any one, that is well affected to the peace of the Church, and not pre-engaged in Disputes, will receive sufficient satisfaction herein, who will at his leisure spend a few hours in a publick Library to read, entire, and not by cited parcels, the short

ſhort Diſcourſes, on this ſubject, of * St. *Ambroſe*, *De Myſter. initiand.* cap. 9. —— * *The Author of the Books*, De Sacramentis [aſcribed to the ſame Father] *l.* 4. the 4, and 5, *Chapters.* —— * *Cyrill. Hieroſol. Catecheſ. Myſtagog.* 4, and 5. —— * *Chryſoſtom, in Matt. Homil.* 83. —— *In Act. Apoſt. Hom.* 21. —— *In*, 1 *Cor. Hom.* 24. * *Greg. Nyſſen. Orat. Catechet. c.* 36, 37. * *Euſeb. Emiſſen.* or *Cæſarius Arelatenſ. De Paſchate Serm.* 5. * *Hilarius Pictav. De Trinitate*, the former part of the *eighth* book. —— * *Cyril. Alexand. In Evangel. Johan. l.* 10. *c.* 13. Concerning the Authenticalneſs of ſeveral of which pieces (for the laſt *Proteſtant* refuge is to pronounce them *ſpurious*) you may remember the forecited paſſage of *Caſaubon* †. ſpeaking of ſuch a ſubterfuge of *Du Moulins*, —— *Falſus illi Cyrillus Hieroſolymitanus, falſus Greg. Nyſſenus; falſus Ambroſius, falſi omnes; mihi liquet, falli ipſum* [Molinæum].

† §. 307.

Not, that I affirm here, that every one, that reads theſe pieces, ſhall be ſo perſwaded, and convinced. For, as hath been ſhewed, the *Intereſts* of the *Will* have a ſtrange power of diſguiſing, and miſcolouring things to the *Underſtanding*. As, when, perhaps, the pre-deſign of making a *Reply* to an *Adverſary*, is the reaſon of ones reading of ſuch a piece of a Father; and when one hath, firſt, ſtated the *Queſtion* to himſelf, ordered his Arguments, deduced his Concluſions, ſolved Objections, *&c.* and then, upon ſuch provocation of an Antagoniſt, is brought to examine their writings, here we may preſume, ſuch a one will be very loth to pull down the whole Fabrick he hath built before, and to lay down his Arms: and that it will go hard, if he cannot find ſomething in them ſeeming favourable to his cauſe. Either, 1. For the *Terms* uſed by the *Father*, he will contend, that they are to be taken according to the mode of thoſe times, and not in a proper, or modern, ſenſe: Or, That their *Rhetorick*, and *Eloquence*, fitted, not to ſtate the *Queſtion*, or inform the Judgment, but to move Affections, and gain the Will, doth often make uſe of ſuch expreſſions, as, rigorouſly taken, *tranſcend* the *Truth*. Or, 2. For the *ſenſe* given, when apparently againſt him, he will propoſe ſome ſeeming irrational conſequences and abſurdities, that follow from it; or, ſome other Tenents of the Father, that will not conſiſt with it, and the *Tranſlation* alſo, or the Copy, ſhall many times be blamed. Or, 3. Touching the *Diſcourſe*; He will either pronounce the *whole* illegitimate and ſpurious, as pretended to be found of a different ſtile from the *Father*'s other works: or, ſome words uſed in it, ſome Rites, or Cuſtoms mentioned, that are of a later date or age; or, ſuch work not found in ſuch Editions; or, not mentioned by later Writers: or, that it is *in part* corrupted and interpolated; and, not all of a piece. Or at leaſt, He will find ſome *Clauſes*, in the ſame, or in ſome other, diſcourſe of the *Father*, whereby he may ſeem to *confeſs* in one place, what he *denies* in another: or, which may ſerve at leaſt to render him ſomewhat *confuſed* and *obſcure* in the Point, and ſo, ſerviceable to no Party. I name theſe defences not ſo, but that ſometimes they may be true, but, that they are much oftner made uſe of, than there is any juſt cauſe; and, are apt to blind the unwary, and pre-occupated, and ſuch, as have the infelicity to be engaged againſt Truth, before they are well read in *Antiquity*.

So

§ 321. *n.* 2. So the late Censurer of Dr. *Arnauld*'s last Book concerning the *Eucharist*, *Vigier*, after the two former Combatants, *Arnauld*, and *Claude*, one by taking the *Fathers* in a plain, and literal, the other, in a Metaphorical sense, had each of them challenged Antiquity, as clearly on his own side, seeks to dispatch the *Controversie*, much-what like the *Woman* in the Book of *Kings* †, whose the child was not, —— *Nec mihi, nec Tibi sit*; Saying ‖ —— *That the true belief of the ancient Church, about this point of the Eucharist, is very hard to be known; That there are innumerable perplexities in it; and that, if the* Fathers *have believed the Reality, as he seeth no reason to doubt but they did, they believed it in such a manner, which neither* Roman Catholicks, *nor* Protestants, *nor any other Christian Society, would approve of.* And so, *p.* 66, *&c.* That the former *Greek* Church may not be found *Transubstantialists*, he is content, they should be *Stercoranists*; (*i. e.* holding I know not what panified corruptible corporal presence of our Lord, much more gross, and incredible, than that of *Transubstantiation*). For, whether the *Greeks* fall short of, or go beyond, the *Latin* Church herein, he thinks all to his purpose, so they be not just the same. But then, over-born with Dr. *Arnauld*'s modern testimonies, manifesting the unanimous accord herein of the present *Oriental*, with the *Western*, Churches, here he will have them, to have taken up this their opinion of late from *Travellers*, but by no means to have derived it from their *Fore-fathers*, ——*There may have hapned* (faith he ‖) *a change, since the establishing of the Doctrine of* Transubstantiation *in the* Latin *Church, either by the mixture and commerce of the* Latins *and* Greeks, *or by the Voyages of the* Portugais, *and other Nations, into the Oriental Churches*; meanwhile, the present *Oriental* Churches thus consenting with the *Roman*, it may well be considered, what would become of the *Protestant* Cause, if the Controversie should now be referred to the Decision of a lawful *General* Council.

† 3 *Reg.* 3. 27.

‖ *Engl. Translat.* p. 80.

‖ *P.* 337.

To

A DIGRESSION.

Reflecting on the Opinion of the Greek, *and other* Oriental *Churches, holding a* Real Presence *of our Lord's Body and Blood (whether by* Transubstantiation *or not): much mis-represented by Mr.* Claude, *a* French *Minister*, § 321. *Whose various Artifices are detected, in,*

* *Insinuating the* Greek's *Ignorance, Poverty, Imbecillity; the* Latin's *Power, Missions, Industry, to gain them*, n. 1, 2, 3, 4.

* *Wresting the* Greek's *sayings to the* Protestant's *sense, contrary to their plain expressions.*

* *Affirming the* Greeks *to retain their former Church-Doctrine as high as* Damascen, *or* Gregory Nyssen; *yet not freely declaring the ancient and modern* Greeks *to differ from, or agree with, the* Protestant *opinion*, n. 5.

* *Waving the main point*, viz. Real Presence (*which infers a Soveraign* Adoration); *contending about* Transubstantiation, *and that as an Article of Faith*, n. 6.

* *Barring all Testimonies, save such as press* Transubstantiation.

* *Using the term* Vertue *unreasonably, (as excluding Substance); and thereby making the* Greek *opinion contradictory, absurd and indefensible, and then leaving them to make it good: whereas he ought to have confessed their holding a* Presence *as well in* Substance, *as in* Vertue, n. 7, 8.

* *Shifting all Testimonies against him by disingenuously requiring testimony upon testimony, or by personal exceptions taken against them*, n. 9.

The Greek *Opinion concerning* Transubstantiation, *if made good, how prejudicial to the* Protestant's *Cause*, n. 10.

1. *Concerning* Transubstantiation.

M. Claude, *in receding from the* Latins, *makes the* Greeks *fall short of their own Similitude and usual Expressions, in three Particulars*, n. 13, &c.

That Vertue *may be taken as well augmentatively, adding to* Substance, *as diminutively, excluding it*, n, 14.

The Common Doctrine of the Greeks *carrying further than their Simile, to a total* Transubstantiation, *Proved,*

1. *From their holding the same numerical Body of our Lord, born and crucified, to be exhibited in the Eucharist: present, not by descending from Heaven, but by a conversion of the Elements, and by a multiplication of its local existence in more places, than before*, n. 15, 16.

2. *From holding the Body thus present by Consecration to be Incorruptible, and its Incorruption to depend on its Resurrection, and so to relate to that numerical Body crucified and raised again. Now, the Bread, remaining intire for its substance, or its matter and qualities, cannot be*

be such a Body of our Lord as suffers no digestion, or corruption. Yet something in the Sacrament suffers this. For the Greeks *then (whilst holding the* Substance *of Bread to remain) to lay these changes only on the* Accidents, *not the* Substance *(eating bread, fed only by the accidents) were without a* Transubstantiation *to espouse the difficulties of it; and therefore their opinion implies an entire change of the Bread, as well its matter, as form.* n. 17.

3. *From holding this Body in the Eucharist,* whenever broken whole and entire in each piece, —— to all distributed, no way diminished. —— The Lamb broken, not impaired, ever eaten, yet not consumed. *Which things cannot be said of our Lords Body, if the matter of bread still remain.* n. 18.

Whereas Greeks *and* Latins, *former and later times may be accorded, this Author, to maintain the variance, seems to fasten on the* Greeks *an opinion less eligible than* Transubstantiation, *and to offer violence to the natural sense of their words; leaving the* Greeks *to stand apart by themselves from* Protestants *as well as other* Catholicks. n. 20.

The Greeks *confessed by him not to have opposed the* Latins *for holding* Transubstantiation; *the* Latins *never to have accused the* Greeks *as not holding it.* n. 21.

2. *Concerning* Adoration *of the Eucharist.* 1. *As to their Doctrine.*

Granted, 1. *That the* Greeks *allow and pay to the Mysteries in the Eucharist an inferior relative Adoration.* 2. *A Supreme Adoration lawful and due to our Lords Humanity, where-ever present; and given by* Protestants *in their Communion.* 3. *No soveraign Adoration pretended by* Greeks *or* Latins *to be given to the Symbols (venerable only with an inferior cult) but to the Body and Blood of our Lord.* 4. Real Presence *not being contested, but only* Transubstantiation; *From such Presence (granting its true consequences) follows a lawfulness of Adoration.* n. 22.

2. *As to their Practice.* 5. *The* Greeks *adore after their mode, by inclining the head and body. Whether this be only* relative *or* soveraign *Adoration, is understood from their Doctrine and Belief. For, not to allow the extent of their* Adoration, *as far as their belief of the* Presence *of the Person adored; and their* Worship *the same latitude with their* Faith *seems unjust and groundless: as also to pretend only an* inferior *adoration given, where the same Communicants hold a* supreme *due to the Person* there *present.* n. 22.

More Devotions performed in the Western *Churches than in the* East, *from the* Berengarian *Errors here.* n. 23.

M. Claude's *Concessions and their Consequences sufficient.* §. 1. *To diswade from a Communion opposed both by* Greeks *and* Latins *concerning the Eucharist.* 2. *To perswade rather to the* Roman *Communion.* n. 24.

For trying our Obedience, God permits Evil with many Allurements; Error with many Verisimilities; yet hath always left evidence enough to clear all necessary Truth to the humble and obedient, not to force the self-confident and interessed. n. 25.

In a Search, by comparing Scriptures and Councils, what endleſs labour and diſtraction; in Obedience to Councils, what peace and vacancy for better employments! Beſides, that the rude and illiterate (the moſt of men) cannot ſearch. Muſt theſe believe a former Church now? or ſubmit to an inferior Church-Authority againſt a Superior? But this is Schiſm in them both: and he juſtly ruined by believing an Authority uſurped, that denies to believe one whereto he is bound. n. 25.

The Iſſue of Scripture-Trial (long ſince) was a double ſenſe of Scripture: that Senſe was declared by one, nay ſeveral, Councils. The Party condemned appealed to Fathers *and* Primitive Church, *whoſe ſenſe (as formerly that of* Scripture*) being double, was decided again by Councils; but their Authority rejected. And now it is deſired that the Controverſie begin anew, and return to the Scriptures; or that the Queſtion determine the Controverſie; and, whilſt* Proteſtants *are the weaker party, that all have liberty; for, when the ſtronger, they too well diſcern the neceſſity of Synods for ending differences among themſelves, which (tho not held infallible, yet) upon the Evangelical Promiſes of our Lord's aſſiſtance, require on pain of* Suſpenſion, *ſubſcription to their Decrees, and* excommunicate *perſons teaching the contrary. Witneſs the* Dort *Synod.* n. 26.

M. Claude's *ſtrange Method for exempting from Obedience to the Church, thoſe that pretend not to a Certainty of their new Opinions, conſidered.*

That, if it prove valid, it ſerves as well Catholicks *againſt* Proteſtants *upon the ſame pretenſions; and affords both ſides the ſame plea one againſt the other, in any controverſie ariſing amongſt* Proteſtants. *Ibid.*

If ſearching the Scripture be ſo neceſſary, ſearch there firſt this main point, that decides all others, and ſaves endleſs ſearches, viz. our Lord's eſtabliſhing a juſt Church-Authority *for ending Controverſies.* Ibid.

§. 1.

MUch-what the ſame courſe takes *Monſieur Claude* in his laſt *Reply* to Dr. *Arnauld*. For the ſhewing of which a little more at large, becauſe I am ſpeaking here of the *Euchariſt*, and what I ſhall ſay, may ſerve for a *pre-advertiſement* to ſome, leſs experienced in this Controverſie, that may light on his Book, and are in danger of receiving ſome impreſſions from it, prejudicial to the *Catholick* Faith; I beg leave of the Reader to make a ſtep, though ſomewhat out of my way, yet not much beſide my purpoſe; Remitting thoſe, who think this *Foreign Author* leſs concerns them, to the proſecution of the former *Diſcourſe*, reſum'd below.

The Controverſie concerning the Real or Corporal Preſence of our Lord's Body in the Euchariſt, which for ſeveral precedent Ages had exerciſed the Pens of divers learned Perſons, who ſucceſsfully maintained the truth of the Article, and happily ſecured the Churches Peace, againſt their numerous new-riſen Opponents, became of late years the matter of Conteſt in *France* betwixt two able and eminent Diſputants, *Monſieur Arnauld*, a *Sorbon* Doctor, and *Monſieur Claude* an *Huguenot* Miniſter. A Combate not only ſharp and long, but thro the Manager's skill carried on with ſpecious new Arguments (on the one ſide) and in a way formerly untrod.

The new Doctrine oppoſing *Real Preſence* had boldly (but as it proved unſucceſsfully) demanded an hearing and obtained it, being by ſeveral *Weſtern* Councils publickly ſilenced and coerced; whereupon it ſeemed to ſome a fit expedient, for encouraging a cauſe diſgraced, to ſound the inclination of the then perſecuted (and therefore likelier to join with ſo thriving a Sect, as the Proteſtants then appeared) *Eaſtern* Churches herein, and (if poſſible) unite their intereſts, in caſe they could find them conſenting in this main Article.

To this end the *Lutherans* (whoſe Sentiments approached much nearer the truth, than thoſe of *Zuinglius* and the later *Calviniſts*) addreſſed themſelves to the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, || *Jeremy*, but ſo unproſperouſly, that inſtead of obtaining the ſo much deſired Union, they got only a ſevere check and reprehenſion from him tired with their importunity, and offended at the extravagant liberty taken by them, of differing not only in this, but ſeveral other points, from the ſenſe of the whole *Catholick Church*.

|| See *Acta Theolog. Wittenburg.*

But of late years, by the more frequent Negotiations and Embaſſies into thoſe parts, the Opinion of the *Orientals* hath been in this matter more fully diſcovered, by the induſtry and exact Collection exhibited in the learned Writings of *Monſieur Arnauld*, one of the Antagoniſts in this Diſpute: wherein his Adverſary, much preſſed by many plain and evident Teſtimonies produced againſt him, is forced to ſummon up all his Arts and Skill in his defence, to ſupport an undertaking he found too difficult to maintain, and too diſadvantageous for him to quit, after ſo much defiance of a juſt Authority oppoſing, and ſuch pretenſions that the Orientals conſented with him and his adherents in the Point.

|| *l.* 2. *c.* 1. 1ſt. This Author buſies himſelf || to accumulate many *Teſtimonies* concerning the miſerable *ignorance*, and decay of Learning, in the *modern Greek*, and other *Oriental*, Churches, as alſo that of the *Moſcovites* ||, even amongſt their *Monaſticks*, *Prieſts*, and *Biſhops*, which induſtrious diſparaging of their Science ſhews, he hath no mind to ſtand to their Judgment. He relates their many Superſtitious and ridiculous Rites, and Ceremonies in Religion; their extreme *Poverty*; and ſo, how eaſily they are to be gained to ſay, or do, any thing, with the Mony, or; (to ſpeak in better Language,) with the Charities, which the *Latins* frequently beſtow on them. Hence theſe Nations being ſo *ignorant*, their ſentiments in Religion are leſs to be valued; and ſo poor, their teſtimony more eaſily corrupted.

|| *l.* 5. *c.* 1.

§. 2. 2. He proceeds || to tell us the many opportunities, the *Latins* have had, of introducing *Innovations*, and propagating the *Roman Faith* in thoſe Countries. 1. By ſo many *Weſtern Armies* that have paſſed thither, for the Conqueſt of the *Holy Land*; and have ſetled there, to maintain their Victories; and ſo kept the *Orientals* in Subjection for near two hundred years. 2. By the *inability* of the later *Grecian Emperors* to defend their Dominions; and ſo, their often endeavouring to accommodate *Religion*, after the beſt way for their Secular advantages; and that was, by a *Conformity* in it with the *Weſt*. 3. By the continual *Miſſions* of *Prieſts*, and *Religious* of all Orders, (each of them ſtriving to have ſome plantation in the *Eaſt*;) eſpecially, the *Miſſions* of

|| *l.* 2. *c.* 2, *&c.*

of *Jesuits*, thither; who by their manifold diligence, in instructing their children, educating their youth, distributing many charities to the necessitous, playing the *Physitians*, teaching the *Mathematicks*, &c. insinuate also into them their Religion, having corrupted also several of their *Bishops*. Hence we may imagine, these *Missions* of the *Latins*, having thus overspread the whole face of the *East*, and practising so many Arts to change its Faith, it will seem a hard task to prove, concerning any particular *Testimony* procured from thence, that the persons subscribing it are no way *Latiniz'd*, no way tainted in their judgment; and, that they are not already circumvented, and won over in some Points, though perhaps they may still stand out in some others. [All this he doth, to shew the great industry of these *Missions* to *pervert* the Truth there: But, indeed, manifests their indefatigable zeal and courage, through infinite hazards, to *advance* it: negociating the Conversion of *Infidels*, as well as the instruction of *ignorant Christians*: And *Roman Catholicks* are much indebted to M. *Claude* for his great pains, in giving so exact an account of their *Piety*].

3. Having premised such a Narration as this, to be made use of, as he sees fit, for invalidating the Testimonies of the modern *Greeks*. 3ly. He declares, that he doth not undertake at all to shew, that the *Greeks* concur with *Protestants* in their Opinion concerning our *Lord's presence* in the *Eucharist*; and much complains of his *Adversary*, for imposing such an attempt upon him. L. 3. c. 1. —— *It is not our business here* (saith he) *to shew; whether the* Greeks *have the same Faith which we* [Protestants] *have, on the subject of the Holy Sacraments: This is a perpetual Illusion that M.* Arnauld *puts upon his Readers; but, whether the* Greeks *believe of the Sacrament that, which the Church of* Rome *believes. And* l. 3. c. 13. He saith, —— *He would have none imagine, that he pretends no difference between the Opinion of the* Greeks, *and* Protestants: *and he thinks that none of the* Protestant Doctors *have pretended it.* And, *Ibid.* after his stating of the *Greek* Opinion; To the censure, that he makes it *peu raisonnable*, he saith, * *That to this he hath nothing to answer; save, that* Protestants *are not obliged to defend the Sentiment of the* Greeks: *and, that his business is to enquire what it is; not, how maintainable.* And saith elsewhere, *That both the* Greeks *and* Latins *are far departed from the Evangelical simplicity, and the main and natural explication, the Ancients have given to the Mystery of the* Eucharist. §. 3. —— * *P.* 336. *P* 337.

Here then; 1. as to the later ages of the Church, *Protestants* stand by themselves; and the *Reformation* was made, as *Calvin* confessed it, † *a toto mundo*. 2. After such a Confession, M. *Claude* seems not to deal sincerely, in that, with force enough, he draws so frequently in both his *Replies*, the sayings of the *Greek* writers of later times, to the *Protestant* sense; and puts his Adversary to the trouble of confuting him; And, from the many absurdities, that he pretends would follow upon the *Greek* Opinion, taken according to their plain expressions, saith; these intend only, * a Presence of Christ's Body in the *Eucharist*, as to its *Vertue* and *Efficacy*, opposite to its *Reality* and *Substance*; and * an *Union* of the Bread there to the *Divinity* only so far, as the *Divinity* to bestow on it the *Salvifical Virtue* or *Efficacy* of † *Epist. P. Melancthoni.*

Christ's Body: and * a conjunction of the Bread, there, to Christ's natural Body, born of the Blessed Virgin, but to it, as in *Heaven*, not *here*; to it, as a *Mystery may be said to be an Appendix, or Accessary, to the thing, of which it is a Mystery.* But all this is the *Protestant Opinion.* 3. Again, seems not to deal sincerely, in that, whilst he affirms the *modern Greeks* to retain the former Doctrine of their Church as high as *Damascen*, and the 2d. Council of *Nice* ‖; and again, † *Damascen* not to have been the first, that had such thoughts (*viz.* of an Augmentation of Christs Body in the *Eucharist* by the Sanctified Elements; as it was augmented, when he here on earth, by his nourishment,) but to have borrowed them from some Ancient *Greek Fathers*; naming *Greg. Nyssen. Orat. Catechet. c.* 37. (See this *Father*'s words below, §. 321. n. 14.) and *Anastasius Sinait*, who explained their Doctrine by the same comparison, as *Damascen*, and the *Greeks* following him, did, yet doth not freely declare both these, the Ancient *Greeks*, as well as the later, either to *differ from*, or to *agree with*, the *Protestant* Opinion.

‖ *l.* 3. *c.* 13. *p.* 315.

† *l.* 3. *c.* 13. *p.* 326. --- & *l.* 4. *c.* 9. *p.* 488.

§. 4.

4. Having said this; That, however the *Greek* Opinion varies from the *Protestants*, it concerns him not; Next, he declares: That what ever the *Greeks* may be proved to have held, concerning some transmutation of the Bread, and Wine into Christ's Body and Blood; or, concerning a *Real*, or *Corporal presence*, and their understanding, *Hoc est Corpus meum*, in a *literal* sense, neither doth this concern his cause: who undertakes only to maintain, that these Churches assert not *Transubstantiation:* at least, assert it not so, as to make it a *positive Article* of their *Faith.* His words, upon D. *Arnauld*'s resenting it; *That whereas he contented himself only to shew, that the Real presence was received by the Oriental Schismatical Churches, M.* Claude *diverted the Controversie to Transubstantiation*; His words, I say, are these, * *In the Dispute concerning the* Greeks, *our business is only about* Transubstantiation; *and not at all, about* Real presence. *For it was to this only, and* Adoration, *that I formerly limited my self in my last Answer.* But then, as if this might do him some prejudice, he, as it were cautiously, addeth: ——*Yet I would have none draw a Consequence from hence, that I acknowledge a Real presence established in the* Greek Church, [But here to make his words true, he adds again,] *in that sense, as the* Roman Church *understands it.* And, what sense is that? surely, by the *way* of *Transubstantiation.* And so, you see, he pares his words, till they say no more, than just what he said before: That he acknowledgeth no *Real presence*, (*viz.*) by way of *Transubstantiation*, established in the *Greek Church.* And, this is to say only, that he acknowledgeth them not to hold *Transubstantiation.* Next; concerning the *Greek*, their receiving, or opposing *Transubstantiation*, he hath one Hold more, *Ibid.* ——*It is not* (saith he) *our business, to know; whether the* Greeks *formally reject* Transubstantiation; *Or, whether they have made* It *an Article of Controversie between them and the* Latins; *but only, whether they comprehend it amongst their points of Faith, or no: Our Dispute is only concerning this matter.* One would think, that he had been chaced very much, and driven up to the wall, that to preserve himself safe, he makes so many outworks; and contracts the Subject of his Disputation within so narrow a Compass. But doth he not here,

*l. 3. c. 1. p. 157.

here, for the *Greek Church* alſo, thus decline, and tacitly as it were yield up that to the *Catholicks*, which they have always profeſſed to be the main Controverſie with *Proteſtants* on this Subject; (*viz.*) The *Real* and *Corporal preſence* of our *Lord*; and the *perpetuity* of the Chriſtian *Faith*, as well *Eaſt* as *Weſt*, in the conſtant Belief of this, for all the later times of the *Church Catholick*; which conſent found in the *later* times, is the trueſt proof, from which we may collect alſo the *true ſenſe* of the *former?* And, from this *Corporal preſence* once eſtabliſhed, whether a *Tranſubſtantiation* be, or be not, neceſſarily follows alſo the *lawfulneſs* of a *Soveraign Adoration:* which renders the Diſpute concerning one of the two Points he conteſteth needleſs; and decideth it againſt him: ſince, an Adoration of the Myſteries practiſed among the *Greeks* he is content to allow, but not, Soveraign; Now *Real preſence* makes it out a *Soveraign* one.

§. 5. 5. His way thus far made; and his cauſe pretended not to be concerned, in that the *Greeks* have a *different* Sentiment of the *Euchariſt* from *Proteſtants*; Nor, that they take, *Hoc eſt Corpus meum*, as alſo the *Latins*, in a literal ſenſe, and hold a *Real preſence:* Nor, that they do not *reject* the *Roman Tranſubſtantiation*; Or make any Controverſie with the *Latins* about it: And, ſo all Authorities, ſave thoſe that preſs *Tranſubſtantiation*, being removed from giving him any trouble: Next; For the *Greeks* aſſerting a *Tranſubſtantiation*, the alledging ſuch *Teſtimonies* as theſe which follow, and frequently occur in their Authors, will not be admitted by him as good, or to the purpoſe. —— *That, by the Conſecration, the Bread is changed, and converted into the* very, *the* proper, *the* True, (*or in* veritate, in reipſa,) Body *of Chriſt, which Body alſo is the ſame with that born of the Bleſſed Virgin, and that ſuffered on the Croſs.* —— *That the* Euchariſt *is not a* Figure, *or* Image *only, of this Body, but the* very Body *of our Lord, united to his Divinity, as the Body born of the Bleſſed Virgin was; Neither are theſe now two, but one.* —— Unum corpus, & unus Sanguis cum eo, quod ſumpſit in utero Virginis; &, quod dedit Apoſtolis. *And* —— Calix, quem Sacerdos ſacrificat, non eſt alius, niſi ipſe, quem Dominus Apoſtolis tradidit. —— *That the Bread, that is offered in the Myſteries, is* the very ſame Fleſh *of Jeſus Chriſt, that was Sacrificed at the time of his Paſſion, and buried in the Sepulchre, and which St.* Thomas *handled, and which is at the Right Hand of the Father.* —— *That, after the Conſecration, Though it appears Bread, yet, in verity, it is the Body of Chriſt. Or,* ——— Licet Panis nobis videatur, revera Caro eſt. *Or,* ——— Non manet Panis; ſed pro Pane factum eſt Corpus Chriſti. I ſay, ſuch expreſſions as theſe (very uſual in the *Greeks*,) are not current with him for proving a Subſtantial change of the Bread; Or, That the Subſtance of it, after Conſecration, doth not ſtill remain ſo entire as before. For, as for *Ipſum, propium, verum*, &c. he can produce places in the *Fathers*, where they are applied to a *Metaphor*; where the *Poor*, the *Faithful*, the *Church*, are ſaid to be *Ipſum*, or *Verum, Corpus Chriſti. The Bread is changed into the Body of Chriſt* [*i. e.* he ſaith, not in *Subſtance*, but in *Vertue*] *The Euchariſt is not a Figure, or Image of this Body* [*i. e.* without all *Vertue* or *Efficacy*,] *but the very Body it ſelf:* [*i. e.* in being ſuch an *Image*, or *Figure*, as retains the Supernatural *Vertue* of it.]

But,

But, ſtill I ſay; This *Supernatural Vertue* is not the *Body*. And, if the *Greek's* arguing from our Lord's *Dixit, Hoc eſt Corpus meum* be good, *viz.* That whatever is not our Lord's Body, the *Euchariſt* is not it; It holds as well againſt *Virtus*, if taken excluſively to Subſtance, (for ſuch Subſtance is [Body] here, or elſe, why not *Imago* a Body?) as againſt *Imago*, or *Figura*; as well againſt *Imago cum Efficacia*, as *ſine*, &c. For —— *Non dixit, Hoc eſt Virtus*, or *continens virtutem Corporis mei*, but *Hoc eſt Corpus meum.* And, this being urged by his *Adverſary*, the beſt anſwer that I ſee M. *Claude* makes to it † is; *That the* Proteſtants *are no engagers for the verity of the* Greek's *Opinions, i. e.* He impoſeth ſuch a ſenſe on the *Greeks*, as makes a Contradiction in their Opinion, or arguing; and then leaves them to make it good. Again: *Though it appears Bread, it is truly Fleſh:* [*i. e.* ſaith he; The *Greeks* hold it indeed ſtill Bread in Subſtance, aud not Fleſh at all: But they mean here; that, though it appears or ſeems, yet *it is not*, [ſimple] *Bread: but it is truly Fleſh* [in as much as it now hath the true *Vertue* of *Chriſt's Fleſh:*] making them ſay, *It is*, in truth, that, which yet they hold it is not; ſave only in *Vertue*, or *Efficacy:* And again, that it only *appears* that, which yet they hold, that in *Subſtance*, and, in truth, it is. And, to render this his Expoſition more current, in † his 2d. Anſwer, he ſaith, ——— *We muſt not preſs too much ſuch manner of expreſſions as theſe*, licet appareat Panis, tamen in veritate Corpus Chriſti eſt, *leſt we make the Fathers ſpeak many abſurdities*; And ſo urgeth a place in St. *Chryſoſtom*, where the *Father* ſaith, ——— *That we are not to think of our ſelves, that we are upon the Earth; becauſe we ſee the Earth under our feet: for we are tranſlated into Heaven, and placed among the Angels.* Where, ſaith he, the *Father* denies not abſolutely, that we are upon Earth: and ſo, he thinks himſelf as ſafely guarded here againſt the *Panis apparet* by this; as before, againſt the *Euchariſt* being pretended to be *Ipſum Corpus Chriſti* in a literal or a proper ſenſe, by his ſhewing, that the *poor* were ſaid to be *ipſum*, or *Verum, Corpus Chriſti* too.

† *l.* 4. *c.* 7.

† *Part* 3. *c.* 2.

Such Evidences therefore rejected by M. *Claude*, he requires, for the verifying of *Tranſubſtantiation*, that we produce a Teſtimony, ſuch as this; *That the Bread is Tranſubſtantiated; or, the Subſtance of Bread is changed into the Subſtance of Chriſt's Body.* So that, according to him, The *Bread*, [but, not a *Subſtance*,] is ſaid by them to be changed into Chriſt's *Body*, [but, not into a *Subſtance*]. And, by the ſame reaſon, we may ſay; That our Lord's Nouriſhment, when he lived here on Earth, being changed into our Lord's Body, proves not, that it was changed into the Subſtance of his Body; But ſuppoſe then the Expreſſion running, as he would have it, ——— *That the Bread is changed into the Subſtance of Chriſt's Body*; and, that though it ſeems the Subſtance of Bread; Yet, in truth, it is the Subſtance of Chriſt's *Body*, or *Fleſh*, are we ever a whit now the abler to ſilence him? Or, will not his anſwers ſtill fit as well as before, *viz.* That, though it ſeems, yet it is not the *ſimple*, or *naked*, Subſtance of Bread. —— That it is, *in truth*, alſo the *Subſtance* of Chriſt's Body: *i. e.* containing in it the whole *Vertue* (or, if I may ſo ſay, the *Subſtance*) of this Subſtance?

ſtance? For ſo, it may be ſhewed, ſometimes, that Subſtance is uſed for Vertue.

He Grants †; the *Greeks* cannot think, *Chriſts Fleſh*, or *Body*, to be the *Subject* of thoſe *accidents*, which are perceived, by our Senſes, to remain in the *Euchariſt*; and then, the *Greeks* alſo to ſay: *Videtur Panis, & Vinum, in veritate Corpus Chriſti & Sanguis eſt*; and yet will not yield, that they hold the Exiſtence of theſe Appearances or Accidents in the *Euchariſt* without a Subject. He grants the *Greeks* to hold, *our Lord's Body, that is diſtributed in the Euchariſt, to be inviſible, impartible, impaſſible*; and then affirms them (though it is not ſo) to ſay; *that no other Subſtance is this Body, than the Bread*; and yet not to hold, the *accidents* only of the Bread to be *paſſible, partible*, &c. The *Greeks* ſay, *that the Body of our Lord, which is conſecrated and offered in many places at once, and at many times ſucceſſively, yet in all theſe, is but one, and the ſame, Body: and, that, though it is in all theſe places broken, divided, and eaten by many Communicants, yet it is received by each of them, not in a piece of it, but whole, and entire: and, after this, remains ſtill, perfect, unconſum'd, alive, immortal.* And yet he ſaith †, the *Greeks* do not hold or affirm; *Idem Corpus in* pluribus locis: do not maintain a Concomitancy of our Lord's Fleſh and Blood; nor the exiſtence of his Body in the *Euchariſt*, after a non-natural manner. And, that the ſame *Greeks* do hold, the *Subſtance* of that which is offered and diſtributed in one place, as to one perſon, to be *really* and *numerically* diverſe from that offered, or diſtributed, in another: But, that their meaning only is; that the *Vertue* of this *Body* is in all places *one*, and the *ſame*; and to all perſons, *whole* and *entire*; and muſt he not ſay alſo, that this Vertue is incorrupted and alive? —— *I yield* [ſaith he, † *in Anſwer to D.* Arnauld's *Objections touching* Remigius] *that, if the Bread were made the Body of Chriſt in its Subſtance, it would follow, that our Lord would have ſo many Bodies, as he is united,* [i. e. *in his Divinity,*] *to different Breads* [this he grants, notwithſtanding *Remigius* his arguing; *all theſe Breads but one, and the ſame Body, from the ſame Divinity replenifhing them*; of which more below]: *But, the Bread not being made Chriſt's Body ſave only in Vertue, and in Efficacy, this conſequence is null; becauſe this Vertue, through the whole world, is one and the ſame.* —— *For this is indiviſible, and is all of it entire, where-ever it is.* Thus he. And, that ſuch are his *Anſwers* and *Explications*, of theſe expreſſions of the *Greeks*, as I have here repreſented, You may ſee in his 2d. Anſwer *part* 3. *c.* 2. & 4. —— His laſt Anſwer, *l.* 3. *c.* 9, 10. —— *l.* 4. *c.* 7. —— *l.* 5. *c.* 7. —— *l.* 6. *c.* 10. and frequently elſewhere.

† *l.* 3. *c.* 10. *p.* 263.

† *l.* 3. *c.* 13.

† 2 *Reſp. p.* 514.

§. 6. —— [Where chiefly you may obſerve; that, how punctual ſoever the Expreſſions of the *Greeks* are concerning the preſence of Chriſt's very Body, yet he expounds them only of the Vertue, excluſive to the Subſtance, of Chriſt's Body. And yet this perſon confeſſeth that the *Greeks* hold, † —— *That the Bread is made the proper Body of Chriſt* [oppoſed to figure] *by the way of Augmentation of his Natural Body; ſo, as our Nouriſhment is made our Body.* And yet, elſewhere, more fully —— † *That* [*upon the Conſecration*] *they held an Union of the Bread with the Divinity of our Lord; and, by the Divinity,* [*an Union*] *to his natural Body; and that they underſtood, that*

† *l.* 4. *c.* 7.

† *l.* 6. *c.* 10.

that by the means of this Union, or of this Conjunction, the Bread becomes the Body of Christ, and is made the same Body with it. [I add, as our nourishment, by its union to the same Soul, is made the same Body with ours.] Now then; when we say, that our nourishment, upon such an operation passing upon it, is, or is changed into, or is made, our Body or Flesh, did he candidly here interpret our meaning, who should say, that we affirm only; that this nourishment is our Body, or Flesh, in *Vertue*, or changed into the *Vertue* of it, exclusively to its being also made the *Substance* of it? So; doth this person deal candidly, for instance, when *Euthymius* a *Greek* Author, that held this opinion, expresseth himself thus † —— *Quemadmodum Jesus Christus, supernaturaliter, assumptam carnem deificavit; Etiam Hæc* [the Bread and Wine] *ineffabiliter transmutat* [*i. e.* by his united Deity] *in ipsum vivificum Corpus, & in ipsum pretiosum sanguinem suum, & in gratiam ipsorum.* (Which Grace he explains presently after by this Body strengthning us, as Bread doth; and this Blood exhilarating, and encouraging us, as Wine †;) I say, doth he deal ingenuously, to expound the [*&*] here by a [*C' est a dire*] or, [*id est*] —— *Transmutat ineffabiliter in ipsum Corpus, & in ipsum Sanguinem, id est, in gratiam ipsorum?* Making the Body a Synonyma with its Vertue; Such a Synonymon, saith he, as that of St. *Paul*, in 1 Tim. 4. 3. *They who believe and know the Truth.* Or 1 Tim. 6. 3. *Wholesom words, and Doctrine of Godliness.* But might he not have said, more aptly, such a Synonymon as that in Psalm 32. —— *Verbo Domini Cæli firmati sunt, & omnis virtus eorum; firmati sunt Cæli*, id est, *virtus eorum?* Or Psalm 147. —— *Magnus Dominus & magna virtus ejus. Dominus*, id est, *virtus Domini?* —— But, if the *Greeks* mean, as, he saith, indeed they do, —— That the Bread, by Consecration, is made our Lord's proper Body, though not that Numerical one born of the Virgin, yet another, added to it by way of Augmentation; and so, in some sense, made the same with it, (*viz.* so, as our nourishment is with ours) by the Union, and inhabitation of our Lord's Divinity to, and in, them both; and lastly, that, by its being thus made our Lords Body, it hath also the vivificating vertue of his natural Body, inherent in it; then I say; in plain dealing, this Person, expounding the Expressions of the *Greeks*, ought to have confessed their maintaining the presence, in the *Eucharist*, of this *Substance* of Christ's Body, as well as of its *Vertue*; this Substance, I say, of which they affirm, that it is the *same* with the other crucified so far as, to be united to the *same Divinity*, and in the *same person*, of our *Lord*; and, from this, to receive the same vivificating Vertue; though indeed this new Substance from that crucified *numerically* distinct. Nor, consequently, ought he to impose upon the *Greeks*, as every where he doth, their holding the Bread, after Consecration, to remain still so entirely Bread, as it was before; but only, the *matter* of it so to remain, as the matter of our Nourishment doth, when yet that, which was Bread, is now truly our Flesh, and no more Bread; our Flesh, not by I know not what Mystical Relation to it, but by a most interior Reception, and Incorporation into it, and dispersion through that our Substance, or Flesh, which was existent before.

† *Comment. in Mat. c. 64.*

† See *Psal.* 103. 15.

fore. Nor, laſtly, uſing the ſame integrity, ought he to have ſaid, this new Subſtance to have been held by the *Greeks augmentative* of Chriſt's Natural Body, or alſo to be the *ſame* with it, (as the *Greeks* always ſay it is) by reaſon of a *ſupernatural vertue* of Chriſt's Natural Body communicated to it, (as he uſually explains them); for one thing may have the *Vertue* of another, without being an *augmentative* part of it, or contracting any *Identity* with it: But, that this new Subſtance is held by the *Greeks* an accruit to our Lord's Natural Body, and the ſame alſo with it, from its *Union* to the *Divinity*, and ſo its change into Chriſt's Fleſh; and ſo its partaking alſo the ἐνεργείας, *Graces*, or *Vertues* of it; which the *Greeks* ſpeak of, with much reaſon, as well as of the *ſubſtance*, becauſe in theſe we are moſt concern'd.

Thus, perhaps with much leſs labour, might this ingenious Perſon have comprehended, in his Anſwers and Explications of the *Greek's* opinion more Truth, and gained from his Readers more belief. And for this, I appeal to any other ſober Perſon, when he ſhall have conſidered M. *Claude*'s conceſſions ſet down below, §. 9. and the neceſſary conſequences of them, §. 10. But this Perſon well ſaw the great prejudice he ſhould do to his Cauſe, in explaining theſe Authors in ſuch a manner (which would have made a fair way at leaſt toward a Total *Tranſubſtantiation*,) and therefore judged it ſafeſt to hold faſt to a *vertual preſence*. Now, in this way he takes, many of theſe Expreſſions ſeem ſo clearly to ſay the contrary to what he would have them, as a *proof* can hardly be brought againſt ſuch anſwers, that will not have as little, or perhaps leſs, evidence in it, than the thing that is *proved*. And, in ſuch manifeſt wreſting of an Authors clear ſenſe, it is Conſcience only muſt confute ſuch gain-ſayers, not an Argument. And, in ſuch caſes it concerns the Reader, not eaſily to reſign his Reaſon to anothers engagements; nor ſuffer his Judgment to be figured with the impreſſions of every mans fancy, (eſpecially when oppoſing *Church-Authority*) nor to apprehend difficulty in every thing ſo long, as he ſees it to be conteſted.] This of M. *Claude*'s Art in evading of ſuch, is ſeem very evident, and indiſputable Teſtimonies.

6. But, 6ly. Suppoſe ſuch clear and expreſs Teſtimonies produced, as that no ſuch anſwers can diſcountenance them; nor no exceptions be made againſt *them*, then, eſpecially out of the 1ſt. and 2d. *Obſervations* precedent, he hath ſome at leaſt againſt the *Perſon*. Urge againſt him the Teſtimonies of the *Modern Greek Writers*, ſuch as will admit none of his Qualifications, He tells us, many of them are *Greeks Latiniz'd*, and won over to *Rome*: Or, the writing quoted wants another teſtimony, that it is not forged; ſuch as lived in the ſame times having in their writings not mentioned ſuch a Piece; thus he throws off *Samonas*, and *Agapius*†. Proceed, in adding to theſe the teſtimonies of ſeveral Dignified perſons of the *preſent Greek Clergy*; and that in ſeveral Countries, and Churches of the *Eaſt*, diſtinct, and averſe, from the *Roman* Communion, (By a diligent Collection of which, his prudent Adverſary, hath done the *Church Catholick* great ſervice, * in manifeſting, that the doctrine, and practice

§. 7.

† *l.* 4. *c.* 3.

of the *Greeks*, not only touching *Real Preſence* and *Tranſubſtantiation*; but *moſt* of the other Controverſies agitated in the *Weſt*, conſents and agrees with the Church of *Rome*, and * in repreſenting to the more ingenuous amongſt *Proteſtants*, how ſingular they *ſtand*, and divided, in their Faith, from the whole Chriſtian world, he tells us: They are the Declarations only of *Greeks Latiniz'd*, and corrupted by the *Roman* Miſſions: Though the ſame perſons, ſtill, maintain their diſſent from the *Latins*, as to thoſe Points formerly in Controverſie between the two Churches: and there is much leſs cauſe, conſidering the repugnance to natural Reaſon, for their corruption in this point of a Corporal Preſence, wherein they are made ſo eaſily to be won, than in any other of thoſe, wherein they ſtill ſtand out againſt *Rome*, and cannot at all be tainted: Laſtly, tho' the Teſtimony they give, is not ſo much concerning their own particular perſwaſion; as, what is the *Common* Tenent, and Profeſſion of the *Greek*, [*i. e.* thoſe no way reconciled to the *Roman* Communion,] or other *Oriental*, Churches; A matter, wherein a falſe teſtimony, as it would carry a greater guilt, ſo lies too open to diſcovery. Urge to him the teſtimony of the *Orientals*, eſpecially perſons dignified in the Clergy, that have *travelled*, about ſome negotiations, into the *Weſt*: He ſaith, *l.* 5. *c.* 5. *p.* 594. *There is little credit to be given to this kind of People, who come not uſually into the* Weſt, *but for their own Intereſt*; *and who fail not to ſpeak in ſuch a manner, as one would have them.* Urge to him the teſtimony of thoſe of the *Greek* Communion, *inhabiting* in the *Weſt*, and here indulged their own Service, and Rites, eaſily enquired into; as for example, the *Greek* Church in *Venice*. See (*Reſpon.* 2. *part* 2. *c.* 8.) his anſwer to what was urged out of *Gabriel* Arch-Biſhop of *Philadelphia* the Prelate there. —— *That we are not to think it ſtrange, if one, who had lived ſome forty years in that place, ſuffered himſelf,* [and ſo thoſe under his charge,] *to be wrought upon by the ordinary commerce they had with the Latins.* Urge the *Oriental Liturgies*, which though, not denied to be different in ſeveral Regions, or perhaps ſeveral alſo uſed in the ſame, (as both S. *Baſil*'s and S. *Chryſoſtom*'s are by the *Greeks*,) yet have a great congruity and harmony both amongſt themſelves, and with the *Greek* and *Roman*, as to the Service, and Ceremonies, of the *Euchariſt*. His anſwer is †, —— *That we have not any certainty, that theſe Pieces are ſincere, or faithfully tranſlated*; *or, ſome of them not corrected by the Miſſions.*

† *His laſt Anſwer, l.* 5. *c.* 5. 606, & 608.

As for the *Liturgies* and other witneſſes, produced for the Faith of the *Jacobites* of *Syria*; the *Armenians*; *Cophtites*, or *Egyptians*; *Ethiopians*, or *Abyſſines*; agreeing in this Point with the *Roman*, he thinks them all ſufficiently confuted, from *Eutychianiſm* being held by thoſe *Eaſtern*, and *Southern*, Churches. For, ſaith he †, —— *What can one find more directly oppoſite; than, to maintain on one ſide, that Jeſus Chriſt hath no true Body; that there is nothing in him ſave only the Divine Nature; that all that which hath appeared, of his Converſation in the World, of his Birth, Death, Reſurrection, were nothing but ſimple appearances without Reality: and, on the other ſide, to believe, that the ſubſtance of the Bread is really changed into the proper ſubſtance of his Body, the ſame he took of the Virgin?* Thus he; for his advantage, applying

† *l.* 5. *c.* 6. *p.* 604.

ing

ing the *extremities* of that *Hereſie* to all theſe Nations, contrary to the Evidence of their publick *Liturgies*. But *Eutychianiſm*, taken in the lower ſenſe, as *Eutyches* (upon the miſtake of ſome expreſſions of former Fathers, *Athanaſius*, and *Cyrill*, *Patriarchs* of *Alexandria*, which perhaps alſo induced the engagement of *Dioſcorus* their Succeſſor on his ſide) maintained, and the *Epheſin* Council, *i. e.* above 90. Biſhops, under *Dioſcorus*, allowed, it, affirms no more, than ——— *that the two Natures of our Lord, the one Divine, the other Humane, Conſubſtantial with us, and received of the Bleſſed Virgin, after their conjunction, become one, yet this without any confuſion, or mixture, or converſion of the two Natures into one another.* Now, that theſe Nations adhere to *Eutychianiſm* only in this latter ſenſe, (they not well diſtinguiſhing between *Nature*, and *Perſonality*;) I refer him that deſires further ſatisfaction, to the *Relations* of *Thomas a Jeſu*, l. 7. c. 13, 14, 17. —— and *Brerewoods Enquiries*, c. 21, 22, 23. —— and Dr. *Field on the Church*, l. 3. c. 1. p. 64, *&c.* and of the ſeveral Authors cited by them: and to the teſtimony of *Tecla Mariæ* a Learned *Abyſſin* Prieſt cited by M: *Claude*, † who ſaith: † *l.* 5. *c.* 6. They hold, after the Union, only *Unam Naturam*; *ſine tamen mixtione, & ſine confuſione.* [*i. e.* of thoſe two Natures, of which the One, afterward, is compounded]. Which Teſtimony may ſerve either to expound, or to confront, one, or two, of the other he brings, that ſeem to ſay otherwiſe.

Urge to him the *Confeſſion* of *Proteſtants*, *Grotius*, Biſhop *Forbes*, and others, (though themſelves of a contrary perſwaſion,) that the Modern *Greek* Church believes *Tranſubſtantiation*: for which they cite their *late* Writers; the Reading of whom convinced them in this, though it cannot Mr. *Claude*. Of theſe two *Grotius* and *Forbes*, he replies, ‖ ——— *That they are perſons, who admitted themſelves to be pre-poſſeſſed with Chimerical fancies and deſigns, upon the matter of the Differences between the two Communions*, Catholick *and* Proteſtant; *which they pretend to accommodate, and reconcile.* So he Cenſures *Caſaubon* out of *Spondanus*, † ——— *Levitatem animi Vacillantem eum perpetuo tenuiſſe; cum & his, & illis placere cuperet, & nulli ſatisfeciſſet.* Where indeed, whoſe judgment ought ſooner to be credited, than theirs, who appear more indifferent between the two contending parties? So, To Archbiſhop *Lanfrank*'s words to *Berengarius*. ——— *Interroga Græcos, Armenios, ſeu cujus libet Nationis quoſcunque homines, uno ore hanc fidem* [i. e. *Tranſubſtantiationis*] *ſe teſtabuntur habere*, cited by Dr. *Arnauld*. He anſwers; ——— ‖ *That Pre-occupation renders his Teſtimony nothing worth.* ‖ *p.* 361.

Urge the *Socinians*, becauſe the *Fathers* oppoſe ſo manifeſtly *their own* opinions, therefore more apt to ſpeak the truth of them, in their oppoſing alſo *thoſe* of *other Proteſtants*, and particularly in their differing from them in this point of the *Euchariſt*; He tells us, they are not creditable in their Teſtimony, becauſe ſo much intereſted to decry the Doctrine of the *Fathers* in their own regard; and thus they imagine, *Proteſtants* will have leſs countenance to preſs them with an Authority, that themſelves cannot ſtand to. Urge the *Centuriſts*, confeſſing *Tranſubſtantiation*, found in ſome of

the *Fathers*; and, in magnifying their new-begun *Reformation*, more free-plainly to acknowledge thoſe they thought *errours* of *former* times: He
‖ *l.* 1. *c.* 5. ‖ denies them fit witneſſes in this Controverſie, becauſe, themſelves holding a *Real Preſence*, they had rather admit a *Tranſubſtantiation* in the *Fathers*, than a Preſence only *Myſtical*. And ſuppoſe ſuch excuſes ſhould fail him; yet how eaſie is it to find ſome other, whereby a perſon may be repreſented never to ſtand in an exact *indifferency*, as to whatever Subject of his Diſcourſe?

With ſuch perſonal exceptions M. *Claude* frequently ſeeks to relieve his Cauſe, where nothing elſe will do it. Whereas indeed ſuch a common *Veracity* is to be ſuppoſed amongſt men, eſpecially as to theſe matters of Fact, that, where a multitude, though of a party concern'd, concur in their Teſtimony, they cannot reaſonably be rejected on ſuch an account, either, that their being deceiv'd, or purpoſe to deceive, and to relate a lie, is poſſible; or, that, what they ſay can be ſhewed a thing well-pleaſing, and agreeable, to their own inclinations. For as it is true, that ones own *intereſt*, if, as to his own particular, very conſiderable, renders a Teſtimony leſs credible; So, on the other ſide, almoſt no Teſtimony would be valid, and current, if it is to be decried, where can be ſhewed ſome favour, or engagement of affection, to the thing, which the perſon witneſſeth, and cannot be manifeſted an equal poiſe to all parties: and ſo, for Example, in the Narration of *another* Country's *Religion*, (often made by all Parties,) none here can be believed, ſave in what he teſtifies of them, againſt his *own*. Such things therefore are to be decided according to the multitude, and paucity, and the Reputation of the Witneſſes rather, than their (*only ſome way general*) intereſt; and the Credibility of ſuch things is to be left to the equal Reader's Judgment.

§. 8. But, 7ly. Should all that is ſaid touching the later *Greeks*, from the eleventh or the eighth to the preſent, age, their holding *Tranſubſtantiation* be, undeniably, made good; and, all the Teſtimonies concerning it,
‖ *l.* 2. *c.* 1. exactly true: Yet he ſaith ‖ —— *It will not follow, that a change* [of the Church's former Faith in this Point] *is impoſſible: or, hath not actually happened: and conſequently, that all M.* Arnauld's *long diſpute, about it, is vain, and unprofitable.* I add; and then, ſo his Replies. But here, ſince the true *ſenſe*, and meaning of *Antiquity*, on what ſide this ſtands, is the thing chiefly queſtioned, and debated between the *Roman* Church, and *Proteſtants*, (unleſs he will throw off this too, and retreat, only to *ſenſe of Scripture*,) I ſuppoſe to wiſe men it will ſeem little leſs, than the loſs of the *Proteſtant* cauſe, and too great a prejudice to it, to be ſo ſlightly yielded up; if that, not the *Roman* only, but the whole viſible *Catholick*, *Church* (beſides themſelves,) from the eleventh to the preſent age, doth defend a *Corporal Preſence*, and a *literal* ſenſe, of *Hoc eſt Corpus meum*; or alſo *Tranſubſtantiation*; and ſo, conſequently, doth concur, and Vote againſt them, touching the *ſenſe* of former *Antiquity*; for this, each ſide, in their preſent Doctrine, and Practice, pretend to follow. And I can hardly think M. *Claude*, would ſeem to ſpend ſo great a part of his Book to defend a Poſt, the loſs of which he thought

no-

no way harm'd him. Again; thus it is manifeſt, that in an *Oecumenical Council*, if now aſſembled, the *Proteſtants* would remain the Party Condemned.

8. After all theſe Defences, wherewith he ſeems ſufficiently guarded; He proceeds *l.* 3. *c.* 13. thus to declare the true opinion of the *Modern Greeks* on this Subject, which I will give you in his own words, *p.* 310. —— *They believe* (ſaith he) *That by the Sanctification* [or Conſecration] *is made a Compoſition of the Bread and Wine, and of the Holy Ghoſt: That theſe Symboles, keeping their own Nature, are joined to the Divinity, and, That by the impreſſion of the Holy Ghoſt, they are changed, for the Faithful alone,* [the Body of our Lord being ſuppoſed either to be not preſent at all, or to ceaſe to be ſo, in the particles of the Symbole received by the unworthy] *into the vertue of the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt: being, by this means, made not a Figure, but the proper and true Body of Jeſus Chriſt; and this, by the way of Augmentation of the ſame natural Body of Jeſus Chriſt. To which they apply the compariſon of the nouriſhment, which is made our own Body by Aſſimilation, and Augmentation.* Again, *p.* 237. more briefly —— *The Doctrine of the* Greek *Church is: That the ſubſtance of Bread, conſerving its proper Being, is added to the Natural Body of Jeſus Chriſt; that it is rendred like unto it: That it augments, and by this means becomes the ſame Body with it. By this alſo* (he ſaith, *p.* 334. and ſee the ſame in his 4th. *l. c.* 7.) *the* Greeks *would obſerve in ſome ſort the literal ſenſe of the words,* Hoc eſt Corpus meum, *which* (ſaith He) *we do not; we underſtand them in this ſenſe: This Bread is the ſacred ſign, or Sacrament of my Body. Or, which comes to the ſame paſs, The Bread ſignifies my Body. They, on the contrary, taking the word* [is,] *in ſome ſort according to the letter, would have, that the ſame ſubject which is the Bread is alſo the Body of Chriſt. From preſerving this pretended literal ſenſe it is alſo; That they would have it; That the Bread is made one with the Body, by its Union to the Divinity, by the Impreſſion of the Holy Ghoſt, and by a change of vertue. Or,* as he hath it in his 6th. *l. c.* 10. —— *That there is an Union of the Bread to the Divinity of our Lord; and by the Divinity, to his natural Body: by means of which Union, or Conjunction, the Bread becomes the Body of Chriſt, and made the ſame Body with it.* [with his natural Body.] Again, for preſerving the literal ſenſe, *That they bring the compariſon of Nouriſhment made One with our Body; and that they have invented this way of Augmentation of the natural Body* [of Chriſt.] *It ſeems alſo, That the Modern Greeks underſtand ſome real or Phyſical impreſſion of the Holy Ghoſt, and of the vivificating vertue of Jeſus Chriſt, upon the Bread, with ſome kind of inherence,* [*i. e.* of the vertue:] *Although I will not* (ſaith he) *aſcertain poſitively, that this is the General Belief of their Church, though the expreſſions ſeem to ſway on this ſide. But however it be, this is not our opinion. We believe, that the Grace of the Holy Ghoſt, and vertue of Chriſts Body, accompanies the lawful uſe of the Sacrament; and, that we partake the Body of Jeſus Chriſt by Faith, as much or more really, than if we received it in the mouth of our Body. But we do not underſtand there this Real impreſſion, or inherence,* [*i. e.* of the Supernatural Vertue of the Body of Chriſt, ‖ *viz.* that born of the Virgin,] *of the Greeks. Whence it is, that our Expreſſions are not ſo high, as theirs.* And this Opinion of

§. 9.

‖ See *p.* 338.

‖ *l.* 3. *c.* 13. *p.* 315. of theirs he makes to be as ancient as ‖ *Damascen.* —— *This Opinion* [of the Modern Greeks, saith he,] *seems to be taken from* Damascen: *some of whose expressions I think fit to produce. For it is certain, that, to make a good Judgment of the Opinion of the Modern Greeks, we must ascend as high as him.* —— *And M.* Arnauld *himself hath observed; That* John Damascen *is as it were the S.* Thomas *of the* Greeks. Thus He.

§. 10. But, lest he should seem to fasten such a gross Opinion upon the *Greek* Church as they will not own, nor others easily believe, they maintain; (for he confesseth, that it hath something in it, that appears *little reasonable*; and especially, as to the Augmentation of Christ's natural Body, to be *assez bizarre* ‖;) and lest he should make it liable to so many odious absurdities, as that a *Transubstantiation*, which he endeavours to avoid, may seem much the more plausible, and eligible of the two, perhaps; I say, for these considerations, he undertakes to qualifie, and render a credible and likely sense to, it on this manner: In saying, 1. That they hold indeed an *Union* of the *Divinity* to the Bread, and that in an higher manner, than to any other Sacred Sign, or Ceremony; but yet not *Hypostatical*. 2. That they hold the Bread changed into an augmentative part of Christ's natural Body; but, it remaining still *entire* Bread as before, and altered only in a *Supernatural Vertue*, added to it. 3. Hold it to be joined to Christ's Body, and augmenting it; but so, as to be not *individually* the same, but *numerically* distinct from it, as also those new parts we receive by nourishment, are distinct from all the former parts of our Body. 4. To be joined to this natural Body of Christ, not locally, or to it as present in the Eucharist; but, as in Heaven. How this? As, saith he, a Mystery may be said to be an *Appendix*, or Accessory, to the thing, of which it is a Mystery. And, to these four Qualifications this Author seems necessitated; because, otherwise, *Adoration, and Transubstantiation, in some part*, though not a total; *Existence of the Accidents without a Subject*; *The same Body at once in many places*; and several other Consequents, thus appearing also in the *Greek's* Opinion, would have given too much countenance to the *Roman*.

‖ *p.* 336.

§. 11. Where you may observe; that there are three things wherein his explaining of this Opinion, he imputes to the *Greeks*, to render it more remote from the *Latins*, falls short of that, which, according to the Comparison, and the expressions, they use, he is justly obliged to maintain. 1. The first, That the *Union* of the Divinity to the Consecrated Bread, is *Hypostatical*, or Personal. For such an Union had our Lord's *Divinity* to the *Nourishment*, (to which this is compared) received by him, and added to his natural Body, born of the Blessed Virgin: ‖ And no less Union than this will serve to make the Eucharistical Bread one, and the same, with it (a thing constantly affirmed by the *Greeks*,) at least as to the *Suppositum*; or to make both these the Body of the same *Person*. *The difference of the Union*, (saith M. *Claude* ‖) *is discerned by the difference of the effect it produceth in the things.* Now what thing more is requisite to stile it an Union Hypostatical (*Hypostasis*, and *Subsistentia*, or *Persona*, with the Greeks, importing the same thing,) than this effect, that it renders this Body, to which it unites it self,

‖ *See M.* Claude 2*d. Answ. part.* 2. *c.* 2. *p.* 249. ‖ *l.* 6. *c.* 10. *p.* 867.

ſelf, and that Body born of the Bleſſed Virgin, the ſame Body of one *Perſon:* and this Union gives to this *new* Body, the ſelf-ſame vivificating vertue, Phyſically inherent, as it doth to the other *Natural?* And then, ſuch an Hypoſtatical Union, if granted, will infer the ſame Dignity of this breaden body with the other: the ſame Ceremonies of Honour and Adoration due: Things, which this Perſon is unwilling to hear of; and that would ruine his Cauſe.

The 2d. That there is a Subſtantial change of the Bread; *i. e.* of the §. 12. ſubſtantial form of Bread at leaſt; in that this Bread is truly made the Fleſh, and Blood, and animated with the humane Soul, of our Lord, as well as, united to his Divinity: For ſo the *Nouriſhment* received by our Lord on Earth, and added to his Body born of the Virgin, remained not ſtill, *Bread*; but was truly changed into his *Fleſh*; and ſo alſo is ours. And the *Expreſſions* of the *Greeks* are ſutable, and cannot, without an unjuſt force and ſtraining, be otherwiſe explicated.

To inſtance in one or two. Such is that of *Theophilact*, in Matt. 26. —— *Non enim dixit: Hæc eſt figura; ſed Hoc eſt Corpus meum. Ineffabili enim operatione transformatur, etiamſi nobis videatur Panis, quoniam infirmi ſumus & abhorremus crudas carnes comedere, maxime hominis carnem: & ideo Panis quidem apparet, ſed revera Caro eſt.* And in *Marc.* 14. —— *Et quomodo, inquis Caro non videtur? Sanguinem propoſitum, & carnem videntes, non ferremus, ſed abhorremus. Idcirco miſericors Deus, noſtræ infirmitati condeſcendens, ſpeciem quidem Panis & Vini ſervat, in virtutem autem carnis & ſanguinis tranſelementat.* Where, if *Theophylact* had meant by [*Caro vere eſt.*] *Caro tantum in virtute eſt*, he would never have given this reaſon, in his comment on Matt. —— *Panis apparet, quod vere eſt Caro, quoniam infirmi ſumus, & abhorremus crudas carnes:* but rather would have removed all difficulty here, and prevented ſuch a Queſtion; *Cur Caro non videtur?* by telling them: *Ut apparet, ita eſt, Panis: Caro autem eſt, non vere, aut in ſubſtantia, ſed tantum in Virtute.* This had been plain dealing: but then he had overthrown his Text: *Hoc eſt Corpus meum, non figura Corporis mei*; and made it only, (as M. *Claude* doth,) at the moſt, *Hoc eſt Efficax figura Corporis mei, non ipſum Corpus.* As for the pains M. *Claude* hath taken ‖ to qualifie this *Panis apparet, Caro vere eſt*, in mingling together *Theophilact*'s Comments on *Matthew*, *Mark*, and *John*; and in taking *Speciem Panis* in S. *Mark*, not for the ſhew, or appearance; but Subſtance, of Bread (by which it ſhould run, not *vere Caro*, but *vere Panis*, in his Comment on S. *Matt.*) and in underſtanding *Virtus Carnis* in S. *Mark*, with a *tantum*; (ſo as this excludes *vere Caro*, in S. *Matt.*) I am confident, that the ingenious Reader will find therein only great induſtry uſed to obſcure a clear Truth. ‖ *l.* 4. *c.* 7. *p.* 448

For *Vertue* may be uſed as well augmentatively, as diminutively, in reſpect of Subſtance; as including Subſtance, and adding ſomething to it, and as oppoſing an outward ſhew only without Reality, or a Subſtance without efficacy; as D. *Arnauld* ‖ hath judiciouſly obſerved; and, for clearing it, inſtanced in that of St. *Paul* 2 Tim. 3. 5. —— *Habentes ſpeciem quidem pietatis, virtutem ejus abnegantes:* and that of S. *Gregory Nyſſen. Orat. Catechet.* ‖ *l.* 2. *c.* 5. *p.* 186.

Catechet. c. 37. ——*Igitur unde in illo corpore* [of our Lord, when here on Earth] *transmutatus Panis transit in Divinam virtutem; per idem* [Verbum] *nunc fit similiter; Nam & illic Gratia Verbi Corpus, cui ex Pane erat substantia & quodammodo ipsum erat Panis, sanctum fecit: & hic* [in the Eucharist] *similiter, Panis, sicut dicit Apostolus, sanctificatur per Verbum Dei, & orationem, non eo quidem, quod, per comestionem & bibitionem in Verbi Corpus evadat; sed quod, statim, per Verbum in Corpus transmutetur, sicut dictum est a Verbo: Hoc est Corpus meum.* And afterwards he saith, —— *In illud* [Corpus immortale Christi, mentioned before] *transelementata eorum, quæ apparent, Natura.* Which place, because D. *Arnauld* much pressed as throughly clearing that of *Theophilact*, our Lords *Nourishment* being changed, as into the vertue, so doubtless also into the *Substance* of his Body; and because it is that place, from which first Source M. *Claude*, ‖ *l.* 3. *c.* 13. ‖ derives the Modern *Greek* Opinion, I was curious to search what M. *Claude* would say to it; but I found him, as to speak to that of S. *Paul*, and other passages, so, prudently, to pass over this, the most insisted on by his Ad- ‖ 2 *Resp. part* versary, in silence. But who pleaseth may see in another place ‖ (where 2. *c.* 2. it is urged against *Protestants* for *Transubstantiation*) how miserably this plain passage of this Father suffers under his Exposition of it: Whilst this Expression (*dure & irregulier*, as he calls it) represents nothing else, but *Damascen*'s and the Modern *Greek* Opinion to any one, that hath not shut his eyes, and shews the Modern and Ancient *Greek* Church to be all of one Faith. Here then you see, in *Greg. Nyssen*, Virtus *includes* Substance; Now see it in that †§. 6. place of *Euthymius* cited before †, *added* to Substance, as being indeed the main thing to be insisted on. ——— *Hæc ineffabiliter* (saith he) *transmutat in ipsum vivificum Corpus, & in ipsum pretiosum sanguinem suum, & in Gratiam* [*or* virtutem, *or* vim] *eorum:* which Grace he explains presently after, by this Body strengthning us as Bread doth; and this Blood exhilara- ‖ See *Psal.* ting us, as Wine ‖. And see in *Theophylact*'s Comment on *John* 6. the like 103. 15. addition. —— *Panis*, (saith he, speaking of our Lords nourishment,) *in Corpus ejus mutabatur* [there is the change of the Substance]. —— *Et in augmentum & sustentamentum conferebat*, [there is the Vertue]. Again, —— *Ita & nunc Panis in Carnem Domini mutatur* [there is the Substance;] *Nec nudi hominis Caro est, sed Dei, & quæ deificare valet* [there is the Vertue]. Now, *Virtus* taken thus in *Theophylact*, all things in him agree well together: Thus, it suites well with, *vere Caro est:* —— with, *Ineffabilis Operatio*; Language not so usual for a change of vertue only; —— With the Question, *Cur non videtur Caro?* weakly asked, if *Theophylact* spake only of a change of Vertue, and not Substance too; and if this then the known common Doctrine; —— With this Answer to the Question; which as I have shewed, in case he held a presence of Vertue only, ought to have been quite another; and such as a *Protestant* now would give. Lastly, it suites well with his former arguing. —— *Non enim Dixit*; *Hoc est Figura Corporis, sed, Hoc est Corpus*, (which, if good, must hold as well of *virtus*, or of any thing else, that is not *ipsum Corpus*). But Vertue taken so exclusively, overturns all; and makes *Theophylact* contradict himself, that he may not, M. *Claude*. Thus much in vindication of the true sense of *Vertue*, when used by the *Greek Authors*.]

A like

A like paſſage to this in *Theophylact*, ſee in *Remigius Antiſidor: in Expoſ. Miſſæ*, a follower, as M. *Claude* grants || of the Opinion of *Damaſcen*, and the Greeks. —— *Cum Myſterium ſit* (ſaith he) *quod aliud ſignificat, Si* [Euchariſtia] *in veritate Corpus Chriſti eſt, quare appellatur myſterium? Propterea utique; quia poſt Conſecrationem aliud eſt, aliud videtur. Videtur ſiquidem Panis & Vinum; ſed in veritate Corpus Chriſti eſt & Sanguis. Conſulens ergo omnipotens Deus infirmitati noſtræ, qui uſum non habemus comedere Carnem crudam & Sanguinem bibere, facit, ut in priſtina remaneant forma illa duo munera, etſi, in veritate, Corpus Chriſti & Sanguis, ſicut ipſe dixit*, &c. Where *Priſtina forma* cannot be extended to the internal ſubſtantial Form or Eſſence of Bread ſtill remaining, as M. *Claude* || would divert the ſenſe; For this internal Form or Eſſence, either in the Bread, or Fleſh, ſince not ſeen, neither cauſeth, nor removeth Horror; and the maintaining of this Form ſutes not with the *In veritate Chriſti Corpus eſt*; and *vere Caro eſt*, in theſe Authors; which expreſſions do imply, *In veritate*, not *Panis*; but is to be underſtood only of the *external form*, and other qualities thereof, occuring to ſenſe, the ſight, taſte, &c. For, ſo that the Euchariſt hath all theſe exterior qualities of Bread, where we do not ſee, or taſte, we dread not, crude Fleſh; and the horror, we have, is from its *appearing*, not from its *being*, Fleſh. Now this, [*Panis quidem apparet: Caro vere eſt,*] of the *Greeks*, what is it, but ſaying the ſame thing with that of the *Latins*. —— *Subſtantia Panis mutatur in Carnem, licet remaneant adhuc accidentia Panis, quæ ſub ſenſum cadunt.* And hence, when, upon an unuſual expreſſion happening in the Council at *Conſtantinople* under *Conſtantinus Copronymus*, [*that the only Image adorable, was the* εἰκὼν ἀνθρώπου Corporis Chriſti *in the Holy Sacrament*] the *Real* and *corporal preſence* from a jealouſie, (though cauſleſs as this Council explained it ſelf) that this expreſſion might vary, or derogate ſomething from it, began now to be more particularly inſiſted upon and explicated, a curious Queſtion aroſe among the *Greeks*, as well as *Latins*: Whether, upon the Bread being thus changed, and becoming our Lord's Body, the Body of our Lord were digeſtible, and corruptible? which cauſed to ſome, affirming it, the imputation of *Stercoraniſm.* But ſuch odious name, ſurely, theſe could never have incurred, no more than now *Proteſtants* do, had they held, (at leaſt, as the oppoſite party underſtood them) only a vivificating vertue of our Lords Body to reſide in the Bread, and not the very Subſtance of his Body to be preſent inſtead of it, according to the then common Opinion.

|| *l. 6. c. 10. p. 862.*

|| *p. 869.*

This of the 2d. thing, wherein M. *Claude*'s explication is deficient; the change the *Greeks* held of the Bread, into the Subſtance of our Lord's Body, at leaſt ſo far, as our Nouriſhment is, into the Subſtance of ours, the principal reaſon of their uſing this ſimilitude; Yet, wherein M. *Claude* deſerts it, though, in ſome other things, more advantagious to him, (as in the matter of the nouriſhment ſtill remaining, and that numerically diſtinct from the Body nouriſhed,) he preſſeth it too far. Now this 2d. thing, [the Bread in the Euchariſt its receiving ſuch a change, as our Nouriſhment,] once granted, will be at leaſt an half-Tranſubſtantiation of it; the

Substantial Form of Bread being gone; the former Qualities of Bread gone, *viz.* from their any longer inherence in the Bread; So that the Substance, not of Bread, but of Flesh, is also under the former Accidents of the Bread; The name also gone with the thing; it being in truth now no more to be called *Bread*, but the *Flesh* of our Lord. And so, when the Bread is said by S. *Damascen*, to be united to the Divinity, it must be understood so, as that, in the Union, it becomes another thing; though still it remains a *diverse* thing from the Divinity. Hence also the pretence of the Bread its being made our Lord's Body only in *Vertue*, not in *Substance*, gone; and all M. *Claude*'s quest after this word *Vertue* in the *Greek* Authors useless, and his Descants upon it unsound: of which enough hath been said already, §. 6.

§. 13. The 3d. (If we may prosecute their *similitude* of *nourishment* to its utmost extent,) That there is a local Union of the Bread and Body of our Lord; not, by way of Accumulation, and Addition: or of Continuation only; as a Leg and an Arm are joined in the same Body; but by way of an interior reception one into the other, and the most intimate commixtion and confusion of them, as to the least natural parts, that are divisible, and capable of digestion, one within the other: So as the least part of one cannot be severed from the other, or communicated without the other; and, as to any actual separation of them, (a thing not fecible,) they may be said to be *numerically* the same; which comes also the nearest to a *total* transition, even of its *matter* also, into another Substance; though, as to this total Conversion, we must permit the operation of Gods Omnipotency (out of his infinite kindness to us) in the Holy Eucharist to stand singular, and unparallel'd by any work of Nature.

All these three therefore the Author, in dealing ingenuously with the *Greeks* Comparison, and their Expressions, as it seems to me, ought to have allowed. But this, probably, he much dreaded; as seeing he might as well, nay in some respects better, have admitted a total *Transsubstantiation* of Matter as well as Form; which would have avoided those many prejudices and indignities, which an *Impanation* labours under. But yet thus the Sentiment of the *Greeks*, supposing no total Conversion, is advanced far beyond not only M. *Claude*'s, and the *Calvinists*, *vertual presence*, but also the *Lutherans Consubstantiation*. For, whereas these hold only Bread, and Christs natural Body joined in the Eucharist, so that the Body and the Bread are two several things still, this Opinion holds the one changed into the other so, as that, as *Jeremy* the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople*, replied upon the *Lutherans* in his second Answer || (and as *Damascen* also said long before. ||)

|| c. 4.

|| *De Fid. Orthod. l. 4. c. 14* —— *Non duo jam sunt* [*i. e.* as the *Lutherans* said, *Panis*, and *Corpus Christi*, joined,] *sed unum, & idem*, [*i. e.* Corpus Christi *only*]. The Bread made his natural Flesh; animated with his Soul; Hypostatically united to his Divinity: in fine, the same with his Body, as much at least as our Nourishment, interiorly received, and digested is with ours.

§. 14. Thus far the *Greeks* usual *Simile* carries us. But their Common Doctrine farther, even to a *total Transsubstantiation*, as I think will appear from what follows.

1. For,

1. For, 1ſt. They hold; that the ſame *Numerical* Body of our Lord, that was born of the Virgin, and Crucified, is exhibited to us in the Euchariſt: Preſent, not by his deſcending from Heaven; but, by the Converſion of the Conſecrated Elements into the ſelf-ſame Body, and by the multiplication of its *local Exiſtence* in more places, than before. 1.

1. Which appears; 1ſt. From this; That the Identity of the Body Conſecrated, and that Crucified, *quoad ſuppoſitum*, or as both united to, and filled with, the ſame Divinity, (which well conſiſts with a Real, Subſtantial, Numerical, diverſity between themſelves,) is not ſufficient, that the one of them, therefore, may be denominated of the other; or this ſaid to be that; nor yet ſufficient, that *all* the ſame things may be ſaid of them both. Some *general* things indeed may be predicated of them, wherein both agree; but their Properties *individual*, *as local preſence*, *Motion*, any *particular* Qualities or applications of them cannot: (Yet which *Individual* properties are uſually applied by the *Greeks* to the Body Crucified, and to that diſtributed in the Euchariſt, as one, and the ſame.) Any Individual Properties of the one or the other, I grant, may always be truly denominated of our Lord's *Body* in *general*, as we will; But cannot be truly ſaid of both, or either of *theſe*, the *Conſecrated*, and the *Crucified*, as we pleaſe, if theſe not numerically the ſame. So we cannot ſay, That ones Soul is his Body; or a Leg, an Arm; or, the one in the ſame place, or motion, or every way affected, as the other is, becauſe that both are parts of one and the ſame Perſon, or Body, and both animated with one and the ſame Soul. And, for a *Grecian Prieſt* to tell his Communicants, that he delivers them the ſame Body that was Crucified and offered for their Salvation, and Redemption, (when he gives them neither it, nor any part of it,) becauſe he gives them another Augmentative Breaden part, belonging to the ſame Perſon, which Perſon indeed was Crucified for them, ſeems too bold an Equivocation to be, by this Perſon, ſo confidently impoſed on the *Greek* Church, and their ordinary expreſſions. The *Truth* therefore of that, which the *Greeks*, or other *Latins*, embracing their Opinion, do affirm; *viz.* that the Euchariſt, Conſecrated in never ſo many places, are all the ſelf-ſame Body, one with another; and all, with the Crucified; becauſe repleniſhed every where with the ſame *Divinity*, muſt be underſtood to proceed, not from the meer Union, or Conjunction, how intimate ſoever, of theſe two (as is ſhewed but now:) but to proceed from the effect (as M. *Claude*, preſſed with his Adverſary's Arguments, confeſſeth ‖) from the effect, I ſay, which this Divinity, firſt uniting, or conjoining it ſelf to the Elements upon the words of Conſecration, worketh in them to make them, by a total Tranſmutation of their Subſtance, (for nothing leſs can do it) individually all one, and the ſame, with one another, and with that Crucified; after which follows another, an *Hypoſtatical Union* of the ſame Divinity to them, as made our Lord's Body. ‖ p. 867.

2. Again: Their holding a *Numerical* Identity every where of this Body of our Lord appears from this; that they explain its being, in all places, but one; and in every place, and in every Particle whole and intire, by

the *Divinity's* being ſo; and the Divinity is ſo, numerically. See that paſſage of *Remigius*, and *Alcuin*, (cited by M. *Claude*, l. 6. c. 10.) concerning the *effect* of this repletion of the Conſecrated Elements by the Divinity. —— *Sicut Divinitas Verbi Dei una eſt*, [una numero] *quæ totum implet mundum*; *Ita licet multis locis, & innumerabilibus diebus, illud Corpus conſecretur, non ſunt tamen multa corpora Chriſti, neque multi Calices*; *ſed unum Corpus Chriſti, & unus Sanguis cum eo quod ſumpſit in utero Virginis & quod dedit Apoſtolis. Divinitas enim verbi replet illud quod ubique eſt*, [the Bread] *& conjungit, ac facit* [by a tranſmutation of this Bread by the Divinity joined to it,] *ut, ſicut ipſa* [Divinitas, quæ totum implet mundum, tamen] *una eſt, ita* [quod ubique eſt, *or* Panis] *conjungatur* [*i. e.* by ſuch a tranſmutation of it] *Corpori Chriſti, & unum corpus ejus ſit in veritate.* [*i. e.* one not only as to the Perſon, but one in Reality and Eſſence, as the Divinity is one; and otherwiſe, that, which follows, and which he collects from this Unity, cannot be true]. *Unde animadvertendum eſt, quod ſive plus ſive minus quis inde percipiat, omnes æqualiter Corpus Chriſti integerrime ſumunt, & generaliter omnes, & ſpecialiter unuſquiſque.* Certainly, where the whole is in every part, and every part (if I may ſo ſay) contains in it the whole, here is ſuppoſed a *numerical* Identity, and a *ſicut Divinitas una eſt.* Nor hath M. *Claude*, in his holding the Subſtance of the Euchariſt, in ſeveral places, really diverſe, and ſo, to each Communicant, any way to relieve himſelf in anſwer to ſuch expreſſions, neceſſarily inferring a total Tranſubſtantiation, but by inducing his *vertual preſence* only, which *Vertue* he ſaith is every where numerically the ſame; and whole, and entire, to every Receiver. This for *Remigius.*

And here alſo, if we may make uſe of a Negative Argument (which is ſometimes very weak, ſometimes very ſtrong, and convincing, according to the circumſtances, which muſt be left to the prudent to conſider,) whereas the *Greek* Doctors, had they declared the Body of our Lord, that is diſtributed in the Euchariſt, to be *really* diverſe from that on the Croſs; and when Conſecrated in ſeveral places diverſe one from another, (a neceſſary conſequent, as M. *Claude* ſaith, of their Tenent,) might have rendred this Myſtery much more eaſie, and intelligible; Yet they have never mentioned any ſuch diverſity; but ſtill, as it were to prevent and ſtrangle any ſuch fancy, cautiouſly added, and it is *one* and the *ſame* with that which was born, and dyed for us; And, for this *numerical* Identity, urge our Lords own words †, —— *Hoc eſt illud, quod tradetur*, that Fleſh of his, that was to be Crucified; and ſo for his Blood, *qui effundetur*, that was to be ſhed on the Croſs. As if our Lord would make this for ever a firm Article of our Faith, and prevent all ſuch Equivocation, as *eadem caro quoad ſuppoſitum*, or *perſonam.* And, upon this ſuppoſition of the ſame numerical Body here preſent, the *Greeks* (miſtaking the ſenſe of it) cenſure the expreſſion of the *Latins* in their Canon. —— *Jube hæc preferri per manus ſancti Angeli tui in ſupercæleſte Altare tuum, &c.* as incongruous, if pronounced after the Conſecration once ended. For ſo, ſaith *Cabaſilas* †, *Quomodo fuerit, ſi nondum eſt, ſupercæleſte ipſum Corpus Chriſti, quod eſt ſupercæleſte? Quomodo ſurſum ferretur*

† Mat. 26. 28. Luk. 22. 19.

† *Liturg. expoſ. c.* 30.

retur in manu Angeli, quod ſupra omnem Principatum? &c. [that is above already]. *But* this *Quomodo* might ſoon have been anſwered by himſelf, if he held this Conſecrated here a new body, really diſtinct from that above. This, of the 1ſt. proof of a *Total Tranſubſtantiation*, the *Greeks* holding the Euchariſt the ſame numerical body with that Crucified; which, according to M. *Claude*, neceſſarily infers a *Total Tranſubſtantiation* of the Bread, as well for its Matter, as Form.

2ly. They hold the *Body*, that is thus preſent by Conſecration, to be *incorruptible*; and this *Incorruption* of it to depend on its *Reſurrection*, and ſo, to relate, only, to that numerical Body that was Crucified, and Raiſed from Death. —— *Quod nec laditur, nec corrumpitur, nec in ſeceſſum abit: Hoc avertat Deus*, ſaith *Damaſcen*: and therefore the *Greeks*, who are ſaid generally to follow his Opinion, muſt, in Juſtice, be freed from *Stercoraniſm*. Now the *Bread*, remaining entire for its whole Subſtance, or for its Matter and Qualities at leaſt, as before Conſecration, cannot be held ſuch a Body of our Lord, as ſuffers no digeſtion, or *corruption*. For, ſomething there is in the Sacrament, that ſuffers this: And we cannot imagine, that the *Greeks*, whilſt holding the Subſtance of Bread to remain, will lay theſe changes only upon the *Species*, or *Accidents* of it; and not the Subſtance at all; ſo that, though they eat the Bread, they taſte, and are fed only by the Accidents; and ſo, without a *Tranſubſtantiation*, will eſpouſe the difficulties of it. Their holding, then, the Body, that is preſent, and participated in the Euchariſt, to be *incorruptible*, excludes the Subſtance, or matter, of Bread from this Body. And, —— *Panis quidem videtur*, or, *apparet, ſed revera Caro eſt*: as *Theophilact.* † —— *Corpus Chriſti non particulatim diducitur, &c.* —— *Partitio eſt accidentium, ſub ſenſum cadentium*; as *Samenas*: || —— *Non Panis, ſed Corpus Domini ſacrificatur*: —— and —— *Si Panis manens, ſacrificatus fuiſſet, Panis eſſet Sacrificium, non Agni Dei*: as *Cabaſilas*: || muſt all be underſtood of an entire change of the Bread, as well its *Matter* as *Form*. §. 15.

† In Mat. 26.
|| *Dialog. cum Saraceno.*
|| *Liturg. expoſitio. c.* 32.

3ly. They hold this Body, that is preſent, and diſtributed in the Euchariſt, to remain, —— *quoties frangitur, totum, & integrum in unoquoque fruſto*: And, —— *Omnibus diſtributum, minime diminutum.* —— *Frangitur Agnus Dei, & non comminuitur; ſemper comeditur, & non conſumitur*; ſaith their *Liturgy* ||. Not a ſeveral piece, or part of our Lord's Body received in the ſeveral Particles, but all: Nor, thoſe receiving more of this *Body*, that receive more of the *Symbole*: In infinite places offered only the ſame Sacrifice *viz.* that one which was offered on the Croſs to ſeveral Communicants diſtributed the ſelf ſame Body; and: It to each entire; A Tenent flowing from the former, Its *incorruptibility* (and by all the ſame perſons maintained). For, what is ſo, is no more capable of being parted, or divided, *&c.* Now theſe things cannot ſute to our Lord's Body, if the matter of Bread be ſaid, ſtill to remain, and to make up an augmentative part of our Lord's natural Body, but this numerically and really diſtinct from it. For ſo, in ſeveral places will be offered Sacrifices, but theſe really different from one another, as alſo from that of the Croſs: Nor will the Communicants receive our Lord's Body entire, but each apart; and this part numerically differing from that *Corpus*, §. 16.

|| *Miſſa. Chryſoſtom.*

pus, quod traditum est (which Communion of a parcel was a thing objected to the *Stercoranists*; and those, who held our Lord's Body corruptible.) See M. *Claude*'s Concessions concerning this, 2d. Answer *part* 3. *c.* 2. and so his retreat to a *Virtual presence*, to verifie these expressions of the *Greeks*, of this Body *every where* the same, and received by *every one* entire.

§. 17. As for some speeches used by the *Greeks*, in making application of their Similitudes, (none of which can exactly fit so high a Mystery,) that seem not to accord so well with a Total Transubstantiation. —— *The Bread said by them to be assumed by, or united to, the Divinity of our Lord:* —— *The Bread, and his Body by the Divinity, to be made One:* --- *An Augmentation of Christs Body to be made by the Bread consecrated, as, here on Earth, by his Nourishment*, &c. I see no Reason, why this Person should not be contented with the former Explications given of them; Such, as 1. both free these Authors from contradicting themselves; and 2. do render the sense of the *Fathers* unanimous, and the Christian Doctrine to run all in one common Stream; [viz. *the Real Presence, and Exhibition, in the Eucharist, of that numerical Body that suffered for us on the Cross*;] 3. and whereby also may be avoided those many gross absurdities concerning *new* Contracts, and Unions, and *new* Bodys of our Lord, which, being so unworthy these high Mysteries, and very injurious to our Lord's Incarnation, are all avoided by a *total Transubstantiation*. See, if you please, these absurdities mentioned by *Bellarmine De Euchar. l.* 3. *c.* 13. & 15. and by *Suarez. De Sacrament. Disp.* 49. §. 3. The *Divinity* of our *Lord*, then, may be said to *assume*, or unite it self unto the *Bread*; or, to make the *Bread* one with his *Body*, not by a meer joining it to Himself, or to his Body, whilst it remains still Bread; but, by this first *converting* and *changing* of it, by his Divine Omnipotency, into his Body, and then, his uniting, Hypostatically, his *Divinity* to it. And, his Body may be said in some sort to receive daily an *Augmentation* from these iterated Consecrations of Bread to be made his Body, in as much as there is a daily *multiplication* of his Body, as to its local Existence in more places than before, according to the frequency of Communions; whilst his Body, in Heaven, doth not descend, but keeps its constant former residence there.

§. 18. Thus *Greeks* and *Latins*, former and latter times, will be at some accord. Whereas this Author, to maintain a variance between the two Churches, seems necessitated to fasten on the *Greeks* an Opinion, which being taken in its just extent, *Transubstantiation* seems much the more eligible; and which he is forced many times also to pare, and qualifie so, that it may have some Conformity to the Doctrine of *Protestants*, and keep a greater distance from the *Roman*, as offers extreme violence to the natural sense of their words. For Example. He allows, * an Union of the *Divinity* to our Lord's Body in the Eucharist, as the *Greeks* say; But no such Union *Hypostatical*. * Christ's body in the Eucharist the same with that born of the Blessed Virgin, as they say; but in such a sense as mean-while to remain *really, essentially, numerically*, diverse from it. * The Bread, the same body with that born of the Virgin; but, It not changed into Christs Flesh, but remaining still *Bread*. * Bread still, not only for the matter; as it was in our Lord's, or is in our, nou-

rish

riſhment; but, for the ſame Subſtantial Form, and Qualities, ſtill inhering in it, as before. * The Bread made the *very*, and true, body, as they ſay; But *virtually* only, in having infuſed into it, and inherent in it, the vivificating virtue of Chriſts natural Body: (Where the *Proteſtants* leave the *Greeks* to ſtand by themſelves; allowing this Vertue communicated to the *Believer* only, not to the *Symboles*.) * The Euchariſtical body conjoined (as our nouriſhment is to ours,) to Chriſts natural body, as they ſay, but the one only in *Heaven*, the other on *Earth*. * Our Lord's Body in the Euchariſt, by the ſame Divinity inhabiting in both, made one and the ſame with that born of the Virgin, as they ſay; but *Myſtically* and *Sacramentally* only. For, the ſame *Divinity*, repleniſhing both, doth not, therefore, render them really the ſame one with another. * The ſame body thus with that; but no *Sovereign Adoration* due, or by the *Greeks* given, to this, as to that. * This the ſame Body with that; and this alſo, as indiviſible, received entire by every Communicant, as the *Greeks* ſay; but this Body entire, in vertue only, not in Subſtance. * The ſame Body of our Lord in all places, where this Sacrament is celebrated; but only in the former ſenſe; *i. e.* the vertue and the efficacy of it, the ſame. If ſuch be their ſenſe, the Reader cannot but think the *Greeks* very unfortunate in their Expreſſions; or, if not their ſenſe, this perſon preſuming, he ſhould meet with very credulous Readers. This (from *n.* 11.) of the 8th. Obſervation, M. *Claude*'s explication of the *true Opinion of the Modern Greeks*; and the neceſſary *conſequents* of it.

9ly. After this, He confeſſeth; That it doth not appear, that the *Greeks* have made any Oppoſition to the *Roman* Church about *Tranſubſtantiation*, *l.* 4. *c.* 5. *p.* 390. —— *In a word*, ſaith he, *the* Greeks *neither believe, nor impugne*, Tranſubſtantiation. *They believe it not; for it hath no place in the Doctrine of their Church. It is neither in the Confeſſions of their* Faith; *nor Deciſions of* Councils, *nor* Liturgies; [*i. e.* in ſuch Language, as he exacts. Surely, this main Point, the Manner of our Lords Preſence, is not omitted in all theſe: the *Conſtantinopolitan*, the ſecond *Nicene*, Council, the *Liturgies* ſpeak of it; Nor is *Tranſubſtantiation* impugned in them, according to him: is clearly maintained by them, according to *Catholicks*.] *They do not impugne it; For, as far as appears, they have not argued with the* Latins, *nor formally debated it with them in their former Diſputes*. Thus He. And, as he grants the *Greeks* not to have quarrelled with the *Latins*, becauſe they held *Tranſubſtantiation*, So † the *Latins* never to have accuſed the *Greeks*, as if they held it not. There ſeems therefore no great need of *Miſſions*, *diſtributing charities*, *teaching Schools* there, *&c.* to induce theſe *Orientals* to approve a Tenent, which they never formerly conteſted; and of an error in which, though the main Point, theſe two Churches never accuſed one another: Nay, the *Greeks*, in ſome of their Confeſſions, as in that of the *Venetian Greeks* to the *Cardinal* of *Guiſe*, ſeem to have out-done the *Latins*; and to go beyond *Tranſubſtantiation*. § 19. ‖ p. 375.

Mean-while; the great quarrels the ſame *Greeks* make with the *Latins*, about ſmaller matters in this principal part of the Chriſtian Service, and the chief Subſtance of its Liturgies, the Euchariſt, as about the manner of the

the *Conſecration*; and about *Azymes*; and on the other ſide, the great Storms, that have been raiſed between *Catholicks* and *Proteſtants*, from the very beginning of the Reformation, about this very Point of *Tranſubſtantiation*, do ſhew, that, if the difference between the *Greeks* and *Latins* were conſiderable and real herein, there could not have been, on both ſides ſuch a conſtant ſilence; Though in ſome other matters, of *little conſequence*, or, at leaſt, of *little evidence*, ſuch as M. *Claude* inſtanceth in, there can be ſhewed a ſilent toleration of the different Judgments, as well of *Churches*, as of *private* Perſons.

§. 20. 1oly. Hitherto, from §. 9. I have reflected on M. *Claude*'s Explication of the *Greeks* Opinion concerning *Tranſubſtantiation*. Now to view the other Point, *Adoration*. Here 1ſt. He denies not an *inferior* and *Relative* Adoration to be allowed to be due, and paid by the *Greeks*, to the Holy Myſteries in the *Euchariſt*; ſuch as is given to the *Holy Goſpel*, and to other Sacred things. Of which we find in S. *Chryſoſtom*'s *Maſs*, that, before his reading the Goſpel, —— *Diaconus reſpondet*. Amen. *& reverentiam Sancto Evangelio exhibet*. See M. *Claude*'s laſt Anſwer, *l.* 3. *c.* 7. *p.* 219. where he grants; *That the Greeks have much Devotion for* Pictures; *for the* Evangile, *and for the* pain benit; *and for the* Bread *of the* Euchariſt, *before the Conſecration*. 2ly. A *Supreme Adoration* he grants lawful, and due to our Lord's *Humanity* where-ever preſent; and allows ſuch an Adoration actually given, even by *Proteſtants*, at the time of their receiving the Euchariſt, to our Lord Chriſt, and to his Sacred *Humanity*, as in *Heaven*. And, to his Adverſary urging ſome places of the *Fathers* for the practice of Adoration in the Communion, he replies. ——‖ *The Author deceives us, in proving what is not controverted. For the Queſtion is, not: whether in the Communion we ought to adore Jeſus Chriſt our Redeemer, and his Fleſh perſonally united to the Word, repreſented by the Sacrament: We practice it with an ardent, and humble Devotion, when we approach to the Holy Table.* And afterward, —— *Who doubts, but that the Body of Jeſus Chriſt is Soveraignly Adorable.* 3ly. He cannot but know, or elſe hath been very careleſs to inform himſelf; that no *Soveraign* Adoration, is pretended either by the *Roman*, or *Greek* Church to be given to the external *Species*, or *Symbols*, of the Euchariſt, (which they hold Venerable only with an inferior cult, ſuch as is due to all other Holy things,) but only to the *Body* and *Blood* of *Chriſt* contained under them; as the Council of *Trent*, allowing the Expreſſion of *adoring the Sacrament*, *cultu Latriæ*, yet explains it in their Canon thus. †——— *Si quis dixerit in Sancto Euchariſtiæ Sacramento Chriſtum, unigenitum Dei Filium, non eſſe cultu Latriæ etiam externo adorandum, Anathema ſit*: And, as *Bellarmin* † alſo reſolves the ſtate of the Controverſie. —— *Quicquid ſit de modo loquendi; ſtatus quæſtionis non eſt, niſi An Chriſtus in Euchariſtia ſit adorandus cultu Latriæ.* 4ly. In the Fourth Obſervation precedent, M. *Claude* ſaith he will not conteſt the *Greek*'s holding a *Real Preſence* of our Lord in the Euchariſt, Though, he contends, it is not by the *Roman* way of *Tranſubſtantiation*. Now from this *Real Preſence* held by the *Greeks* even after that way he allows, at leaſt, if he will but grant the true conſequences thereof, mentioned before, §. 11. *viz.* An Hypo-

‖ 2 *Reſp. part.* 2. *c.* 8. *p.* 416.

† *Seſſ.* 13. *c.* 6

† *De Eucha. l.* 4. *c.* 29.

Hypoſtatical, or other, Union to this Body offered and diſtributed in the Euchariſt, ſuch as converts it into the Fleſh of our Lord, and renders it the Body of the ſame Perſon, with that born of the Bleſſed Virgin; *non aliud ab eo, quod ſumpſit in utero Virginis*; (by which the People ſeem ſufficiently inſtructed not to diſtinguiſh, in their Mode of Adoration, between theſe two, that they are taught to be perſonally the ſame.) I ſay from ſuch a *Real Preſence* held by the *Greeks* a lawfulneſs of adoring Chriſt's Body, as there preſent, muſt be held by them. And then; if it can be ſhewed by M. *Claude* they do not actually adore, it muſt be reckoned a matter of neglect; not, of Conſcience, or denying ſuch thing due.

5ly. But, now, to conſider their *Practice*. He denies not the *Greeks* to adore, in their Mode of Adoration, (which is by inclining the *Head* and Body; ſeldom, *kneeling*,) when they receive the Communion; their *Liturgies* have it, often repeated; and, ſurely, he will allow them, herein, as much Devotion as he doth to the *Proteſtants*: and alſo them, to give at leaſt an external *Relative* Devotion to the *Myſteries*, for ſuch they give to the *Evangiles*: and, methinks, the witneſſes he produceth. *p.* 216. ſhould not, in general, deny ſimply, any Adoration of the *Greeks* at all. The Queſtion, then, only is; granting already an external Adoration given by the *Greeks*, when they approach to the Communion; whether this, in their intention, be a *ſoveraign* Adoration exhibited to Chriſt's Sacred *Divinity* and *Humanity*, as there preſent, Now; the *Greeks* holding this *Humanity* there really preſent, conceded before, ſeems ſufficient to determine this, without more ado. And, for one to pretend, that this Adoration of the *Greeks* is given only to God; or to Chriſt's *Divinity* as every where preſent; or, to the *Humanity* united to it, but only to this as in *Heaven*; and, not to it alſo as preſent in the Euchariſt, when the ſame *Greeks* confeſs it to be ſo; and, when the Euchariſtical preſence is the occaſion of ſuch their Adoration; here I ſay, not to allow the extent of their Adoration, ſo far as they believe the preſence of the Perſon adored; and their worſhip the ſame latitude, as their Faith, would be an unjuſt and groundleſs abridgment of their Devotions: as alſo this, to pretend an *inferior*, or *relative*, Adoration given by them only to the *Myſteries*, where the ſame Communicants hold a *ſupreme* due to the *Perſon* preſent with them.

To view a little the Form of their *Liturgy*. We read in S. *Chryſoſtom*'s *Maſs*: That the *Prieſt*, after Conſecration and before he takes the Holy Bread to communicate himſelf with it, *adores*: and ſaith, —— *Attende, Domine Jeſu Chriſte, de ſancto habitaculo tuo: veni ad ſanctificandum nos qui in excelſis cum Patre ſimul reſides, & hic una nobiſcum inviſibiliter verſaris; & dignare potenti manu tua nobis impertiri immaculatum Corpus tuum, & pretioſum ſanguinem; & per nos, toti Populo. Corpus tuum*, I add, never ſevered from thy *Divinity*, and thy ſelf. To whom alſo the *Prieſt* had ſaid before in the beginning of the Service. —— *Tu enim es, qui offers & offerris; aſſumis, & diſtribueris, Chriſte Deus noſter.* Then the Prieſt *adores* again, and ſaith thrice to himſelf, —— *Deus propitius eſto mihi Peccatori*; An Act of *Humiliation* uſed here by him, before he takes the *Sancta* into his hands for the Communion, as it was once before, at the beginning of the *Oblation*. And ſo, ſaith the *Rubrick*, all the People *adore* with him. —— *Populus*

pulus similiter cunctus cum devotione adorat. Then he takes the *Holy Bread*, and makes the *Elevation* of it, yet *whole* and entire; saying, *Sancta Sanctis*; And the Quire answers, it seems, with relation to It, yet one, and entire, —— *Unus Sanctus, Unus Dominus, Jesus Christus.* Then the *Priest*, breaking it into four Pieces, saith, —— *Frangitur Agnus Dei; qui frangitur, at non comminuitur: qui semper comeditur, & non consumitur*; [which shews, what *Agnus Dei*, whether this in *Heaven*, or present *here*, is now spoken of, and thus adored.] *Sed eos, qui sunt participes, sanctificat.* So taking a piece thereof in his hand, and preparing himself to receive it, he saith, —*Credo Domine & confiteor, Quod Tu es Christus*, &c. ——*Dignare in præsepe animæ meæ ἀλόγυ, & in coinquinatum meum Corpus ingredi,* ——*& dignare me participem effici sanctissimi tui Corporis & Sanguinis.* [I add, never severed from thy Divinity, and thy self.] Also, when he calls the Deacon, to communicate him with the Holy Bread: 'tis said, —— *Accedens Diaconus* Reverentiam exhibet. And so also before receiving the Chalice. It is said again, —— *Diaconus venit, et adorat semel, dicens: Ecce venio ad immortalem Regem*, &c. Where it must be remembred, that the *Greeks* also held, the Body of our Lord that is received in the Eucharist, to be *immortal*, and *incorruptible*. This we find in their *Liturgy*. And, suitable to this, we read, in *Cabasilas* † (expounding the *Liturgy*,) concerning the People before their communicating. —— *Ipsi autem* (saith he) *fidem attendentes, et adorant, et benedicunt, et Jesum, qui in eis* [donis Sanctificatis] *intelligitur*, [opposed to *videtur*] *ut Deum, celebrant*; Where M. *Claude*'s note is † 1. that —— *Non adorant dona, sed Jesum.* But who saith, that a Soveraign Adoration is due, or given, to the *Dona?* Again, 2. *Jesum*, (saith he) *qui intelligitur, i. e.* only, *qui repræsentatur in Donis.* But all the former Expressions, implying our Lord's presence, shew their belief to be contrary. *Tu es*, (saith the Priest before) *qui offers, et offerris: assumis et distribueris, Christe Deus noster.* And the People, after this adoring, in their receiving, say, —— *Benedictus, qui venit in nomine Domini*; of which, the same *Cabasilas*, ——*Tanquam nunc ad eos venientem, et apparentem, Christum benedicunt.* Who also before (*c.* 24.) intimates the custom of the *Greeks*, in the Service *adorare, et alloqui corpus et sanguinem Domini.* Now I say, All these Passages in the *Greek Liturgy* well considered; Here for one to grant, the *Real* and *Corporal* Presence of our Lord in his whole person in the Holy Mysteries to be believed by this *Priest*, *Deacon*, and other Communicants, and yet to say, their Adoration, and other Addresses and Allocutions are not given and made to him, as there present; but to him, only as in Heaven; or only to his *Divinity* as there, and every where present, abstracted from his *Humanity*, is such a Comment upon this *Liturgy*, as nothing but a strong pre-ingagement can force upon any ones judgment.

† *c.* 39.

† *l.* 3. *c.* 7. *p.* 222.

§. 21.

The Testimonies, this Author brings, † do accuse the *Greeks* of some neglect in this Duty, but do not shew them to justifie it; and these very Persons, that censure such neglect toward the Holy Mysteries after Consecrated, accuse them almost of committing Idolatry toward them before. So that it seems rather some defect, of knowledge, in such, concerning the Ceremonies of Consecration, than want of Devotion. *Cabasilas* †, long ago, observed the same in some ignorant People, and blamed it: but yet, in the same place, allows the Adoration of, and Allocutions made to, the Body and Blood of our Lord, when the Offerings

† *l.* 3. *c.* 7. *p.* 216.

† *c.* 24.

Offerings, are Sacrificed, and perfected. The Conſecration alſo of the *Greeks* being longer extended, and the Adoration not ſo unitedly performed preſently upon the pronouncing of our Lords words of Inſtitution, as amongſt the *Latins*; but, disjunctively, at their communicating, might occaſion ſome miſtake in thoſe *Latins*, who accuſed them of a Non-Adoration. So, the other irreverences and indecencies, objected, are to be eſteemed only negligences in private practice; not, conſequences of the publick Doctrine; nor countenanced by their *Liturgies*. Which *Liturgies* uſe as much Ceremony towards the Holy Myſteries, as the *Roman* doth; Where alſo, firſt, the Remains of the *Holy Bread* are carefully put into the Chalice, for the People to be *communicated* therewith; and then, for the *Remains*, after the Communion conſummated. —— *Sacerdos* (ſaith the *Rubrick*) *quod reſiduum eſt Communionis in Sancto Calice, cum attentione, et devotione conſumit, et ter Sanctam Calicem abluit, et attendit, ne remaneat particula, Margarita vocata* [not the leaſt crumb of the intinct Hoſt].

As for ſeveral Devotions and Honours performed to the *Bleſſed Sacrament*, here in the *Weſt*, (which this perſon diligently reckons up, much to its praiſe,) not ſo in the *Eaſt*; (frequently urged by M. *Claude*, as good Arguments of the *Greek* Church not believing *Tranſubſtantiation*, or ſuch a Real Preſence, as the *Roman*;) and, in latter times here more, than in the former, 1ſt. They are held no ſuch neceſſary circumſtances, or conſequences, without the which a Real Preſence may not be believed, and a due Adoration, (in ſome convenient manner or other,) practiſed. 2ly. The occaſion of them is well known to have been the *Berengarian*, and many other, Errors concerning the Euchariſt: which appeared here in the *Weſt*, but diſturbed not the *Eaſt*. Which Errors, inferring many *Indignities* and affronts to this richeſt, and deareſt Legacy of our departing Lord, cauſed the Church to multiply alſo the external teſtifications of her *Devotion*, *Gratitude*, and *Reverence*, to it; and God's wiſdom, as uſually, out of ſuch vilifyings, and diſreſpects, extracted a greater Honour, as to External Ceremony, to theſe High Myſteries. So alſo the many ſubtle Queſtions, that have been diſcuſſed and ſtated among the *Latins*, not ſo much thought on by the *Greeks*, but all ſhut in a *Quo modo potuit Deus*, (another frequent Argument with this Author, of the *Greeks* not believing *Tranſubſtantiation*) acknowledge the ſame Original, *viz.* the Provocations, Objections, contrary falſe-poſitions, of the Heterodox, which forced the Church to deſcend to the ſame particulars with them: Nor could ſhe cenſure theſe as Errors, without eſtabliſhing their Contradictories, as *Truth*. This of *Adoration*.

To conclude. The many Conceſſions of M. *Claude*, and the Conſequences of them, forementioned, ſeem to me ſufficient, 1ſt. To *diſſwade* any ſober and modeſt perſon, who relies not on his own judgment for the controverted ſenſe of Holy Scriptures, but holds it a ſafer way to conform to that of Church-Authority; to diſſwade him, I ſay, from any ſuch Communion, as he ſees, by the former Account, oppoſed both by the *Latins* and the *Greeks*; *Greeks*, preſent, or paſt, as high as *Damaſcen*, in the eighth age; and may not I ſay as high as *Gregory Nyſſen*, † in the fourth, whilſt both theſe *Latins* and *Greeks* hold §. 12.

§. 22.

† See before

hold a Real, or Corporal presence of our Lord in the Eucharist, and agree in a literal sense of *Hoc est Corpus meum.* Nor will M. *Claude* enter with his Adversary into this Controversie. 2. Next; to *perswade* him, of the two, rather to the *Roman* Communion: as whose *Transubstantiation*, besides that it hath been established by so many Councils †, is of it self much more credible, and more accommodated to the Scripture-expressions, then I know not what fancied Augmentation of Christ's natural Body, born of the Blessed Virgin, by a new Breaden one assumed in the Eucharist, numerically distinct from the other; yet, by the like assumption, and Union to our Lord's *Divinity*, rendred personally one and the same Body with it. But how much more will he be confirmed in the same Resolution, if by what hath been said above, ‖ he discerns M. *Claude*'s Relation of the Modern *Greek*-opinion unsound; and that the main Body of them (except perhaps some few *Impanatists*, that have been there, as also in the *Western* Church) in holding a total substantial change of the Bread, have accorded with the *Roman* Church.

† See the *Guide in Controversie Disc.* 1. §. 57, 58.

‖ §. 14, *&c.*

§. 23.

I hope the Reader will pardon this digression, the rather, because, it serves much to illustrate that, whereof I was discoursing, ‖ That (notwithstanding whatever evidence of Truth,) Answers, and Replies, from Persons ingenious, and pre-engaged, find no end; and that, when *Controversies* are, by one of the contending parties, *denied* any Decisive Judge, though error may easily be *overcome*, yet it can hardly be *silenced*. For as God, for the greater trial of our obedience, hath permitted in the world not only *Evil*, but very many *allurements* also, and enticements, to it; so, not only *Errors*, but many *verisimilities*, and appearances of Reason, ever ready to support it, with those that do not by Humility attain the illuminations of his Grace. *Evidence* sufficient God hath left always to clear, and manifest all necessary Truth to those, who are of an obedient Spirit, and willing to learn it: But not sufficient to force (like the *Mathematicks*) the Understandings of the self-confident, and interested to gain-say it; but that they may have some fair colour or other, to oppose to it, and catch the credulous.

‖ §. 321 *n.* 1.

All which still more infers the great necessity of *Church-Authority*, and a conformity to it, and the reasonableness of *Monsieur Maimbourg*'s Method for reducing *Protestants* to the true Faith, *viz.* ‖ *That matters, once decided by this Authority, should be no longer disputed*; A Rule, the *Protestants*, *i. e.* the more *potent* Party of them, for preserving their own peace, would have to be observed in the *Differences* among themselves, (shewed in the proceedings of the Synod at *Dort*, of which see before, §. 254. *n.* 2.) but not, in those between them and *Roman Catholicks*, because here they are the *weaker*. To whom M. *Claude*'s answer in the *Preface* of his last Reply to D. *Arnauld*, is this. --- *It is unjust* (saith he) *that he will have the Decisions of Councils to be Prescriptions against us* [the Protestants;] *not remembring that nothing can prescribe against Truth, especially when it concerns our Salvation. And, the Determinations of* Councils *not being with us of any Consideration; but as they do conform to the Holy* Scriptures, *and to the Principles of Christian Religion, we cannot have from hence any reasonable or profitable way, to end the particular differences that divide us, but only this, to examine the matter to the bottom, to discern whether such conformity*

‖ §. 8.

[*i. e.*

[*i. e.* of the Councils to the Scriptures,] *which we ſuppoſe neceſſary, is; or, is not.*

To which he adds there, as alſo frequently elſewhere: That the ſhorteſt, and ſureſt, and only right, way for ſettling the Conſcience in repoſe, (which muſt reſt its Faith immediately on God's Word and Divine Revelation,) is, for both Parties to proceed to the Trial of their cauſe, all other Authority and Methods laid aſide, by the *Holy Scriptures*. And, when he is preſſed by his Adverſary; That, in theſe Controverſies, at leaſt all perſons doubting, *i. e.* what is the true ſenſe, of the *Scriptures* controverted, and of *Antiquity* expounding them, and not certain of the contrary of what the Church teacheth concerning them, (as all *unlearned* Proteſtants muſt be,) ought, herein, to conform, and adhere rather to the *Church*, than to *Separatiſts*, he ſeeks to decline it thus: That the ſimpleſt perſon may receive ſufficient certainty from the *clearneſs* of *Scripture*, in all matters *neceſſary*; that, from theſe Scriptures learning *what he ought to believe*, he may eaſily know alſo, whether the *ſociety*, he lives in, be a true Church, and ſuch as will conduct him to Salvation, that hence he needs not trouble himſelf with Controverſie, touching what the *former Church* hath *believed*; Yet that, our Lord promiſing to be with true Believers to the end of the World, ſo as they ſhall not fall into damnable error, Charity obligeth him, (without his reading them,) to believe, that the *Fathers* are of this number; and ſo, that they believed, as they ought; and ſo, were of his Faith. To give you his own words, l. 1. c. 4. —— *The word of God,* (ſaith he) *contains purely, and clearly, all that, which is neceſſary to form our Faith, to regulate our Worſhip, and Manners. And, God aſſiſting us with his Grace, it is eaſie for the moſt ſimple to judge, whether the Miniſtery, under which we live, can conduct us to ſalvation: and conſequently, whether our ſociety is a true Church. For, for this, he needs only examine It as to theſe two Characters. One, if they teach all the things clearly contained in God's word; and the other, if they teach nothing, beſides, that is contrary to thoſe things, or doth corrupt the efficacy, and force of them.* And afterward, —— *This Examen,* (ſaith he) *is ſhort, eaſie, and proportion'd to the capacity of all the world: and, it forms a judgment as certain, as if one had diſcuſſed all the Controverſies one after another.* Again, l. 1. c. 5. —— *There are two Queſtions: One, touching what we ought to believe on the matter of the Euchariſt. The other, touching what hath been believed by the ancient Church; The firſt of theſe cleared, we need not trouble our ſelves about the ſecond. Now, as for thoſe of our Communion, the firſt Queſtion is cleared by the Word of God.* And for the ſecond, he reſolves it thus, l. 1. c. 6. —— *That the Promiſes of Jeſus Chriſt aſſure us, that he will be with true Believers to the end of the world.* Whence he concludes, —— *that there hath always been a number of true Believers, whoſe Faith hath never been corrupted by damnable Errors.* Then, —— *that charity obligeth us to believe, that the* Fathers *were of this number.* And then laſtly, *We knowing from* Scripture *what we ought to believe in this Point, we alſo are confirmed, without ſtudying them, that the* Fathers *believed the ſame.*

Now to reflect briefly on what he hath ſaid in the order it lies here. *A Council* (ſaith he) *cannot preſcribe againſt Truth.* True; But the *Council* is brought in for a Judge, where a Diſpute and Queſtion is, what, or, on what ſide,

ſide, is the *Truth*. *The determinations of Councils are not with us of any conſideration, but as they do conform to the Holy Scriptures.* Right; But, the *Council*, is called in for a Judge, where a doubt, and diſpute is; what, or on what ſide, is the true *ſenſe* of ſuch, and ſuch, *Scriptures*. Where, if he meaneth; that they refuſe to ſubmit to a *Council* unleſs conforming to *Scripture*, as the *ſenſe* of Scripture is given by the *Council*, that is it we deſire: for the Council will ſtill profeſs its following the ſenſe of Scripture, if, as this ſenſe is underſtood by the *Proteſtants*, what is this, but to ſay they will ſubmit to the Judgment, or Deciſion, of a Council, ſo often as it ſhall agree with their own? *The only reaſonable and profitable way to end differences, is this, to examine the matter to the bottom*; *i. e.* whether the Deciſions of the *Council* conform with *Holy Scripture*. But, when this is done, How will the Difference end? Will not the Controverſie, as the Replies multiply, ſwell rather ſtill bigger; as his, and D. *Arnauld*'s doth? *Search to the bottom*; Suppoſe a *Socinian* ſhould ſay this, againſt the former Church-deciſions, concerning the *Trinity*, *the ſupreme Deity of the Son, and Holy Ghoſt*; *Gods eſſential Omnipreſence*, *his abſolute preſcience of future Contingents*, &c. will *Proteſtants* ſay, he makes a rational motion? Then, how can any *Proteſtant* reſt his Faith in *theſe* Points upon the Authority of the *Councils*, and their *Creeds?* will you ſay, he doth not? but, on the *Scriptures*. Have they then ſearched all theſe Points *to the bottom* there; compared the particular Scriptures urged by the *Socinian*, and thoſe urged againſt him; and weighed them in the Ballance? If, yet, they have not, ought they? If they ought; what a task here for young *Proteſtant*-ſtudents? what an Eternal Diſtraction in this, [*a ſearch!*] what heavenly peace, in the other [*obedience to the judgments of former Councils*;] and Vacancy for better employments! Again, If they ought: what, *all Proteſtants?* the moſt of them, as of all Chriſtians, are illiterate Men, not having either leiſure, or ability, to ſearch, &c. Muſt theſe adhere, therefore, to former *Councils*, and their *Creeds*, in *theſe* Points? Then ſo muſt they in *others*; and in this of *Real Preſence*, or *Tranſubſtantiation*, and ſo they remain no longer on M. *Claude*'s party. Or will he bind them to ſubmit their judgment to ſome *inferior* Eccleſiaſtical Authority, or Miniſtry, ſtanding in oppoſition to a *ſuperior?* But this is *Schiſm* in them both: and juſtly is ſuch perſon ruin'd in his credulity to one authority uſurp'd, for his denying it to another, to whom it is due; Nor would M. *Claude* be well pleaſed, if any one ſhould follow ſome few reformed Miniſters, divided from the reſt of their *Conſiſtory*, Claſs, or *Synod*.

§. 24. As for the *Trial*, he motions, to be made by *Holy Scriptures*. This is a thing that hath been by the Two Parties already done, *firſt*; as it ought. And the iſſue of it was; That one Party underſtood theſe *Scriptures* in one ſenſe, the other in another; For Example. The one underſtood, *Hoc eſt Corpus meum*, *literally*; the other in a *Metaphor*, and ſo differently underſtood alſo all the *other* Texts of Scripture produced in this Cauſe. Here, the true *ſenſe* of Scripture, became the *Queſtion*, and their Controverſie. For the Judge and Decider of this Controverſie between them, when time was, they took a *Council*: For, ſince *Scripture* they could no more take, the ſenſe of that being their Queſtion, to whom ſhould they repair, but the *Church?* and of the Church a Council is the *Repreſentative*. Councils, ſeveral, to a great number, in ſeveral ages ||, decided this matter,

|| See *Guide in Controver. Diſc.* 1. §. 57, 58.

matter, and declared the ſenſe of the Scriptures; but ſo, as it liked not one Party. Theſe therefore thought fit to remove the *Trial* from thence to the more Venerable Sentence of the *Fathers*, and *Primitive Church*, *i. e.* of their *Writings*. Again, the *ſenſe* of theſe *Writings* as, before, that of *Scriptures*, is underſtood diverſly by the Conteſters; and now the true *ſenſe* of the writings of the *Fathers* is the *Queſtion*, and Controverſie. Nor, here will *Diſputes* end it; Witneſs ſo many Replies made on either ſide. *Former Councils*, as they have given their Judgment of the Senſe of the Writings of *Holy Scriptures*, ſo they have of thoſe of the *Fathers*, but their Authority is rejected, in both; And, a *new Council*, were it now convened, beſides that M. *Claude*'s Party, being the fewer, and ſo, eaſily over-voted, would never ſubmit to it, we may, from M. *Claude*'s Confeſſion ||, —— *That both* Greeks *and* Latins *are far departed from the Evangelical ſimplicity, and the natural explication that the Ancients have given to the Myſtery of the Euchariſt*, rationally conjecture that *Proteſtants*, in ſuch Councils, would remain the party condemn'd. What, then, would this perſon have? He would have the Controverſie begin again, and return to the Scriptures. Which is, in plain Language: That, the *Queſtion* ſhould decide the *Controverſie*: and, till this can do it, That, ſo long as the *Proteſtants* are the *weaker* Party, all ſhould have their Liberty. For, when they are the *ſtronger*, they do well diſcern the neceſſity of *Synods* for ending ſuch Differences; and, though not profeſſing themſelves infallible, yet, upon the Evangelical promiſes of our Lord's aſſiſtance to ſuch *Councils*, think fit to require all the *Clergy* under their juriſdiction, upon pain of Suſpenſion from their Function, to receive and ſubſcribe their *Decrees*, for *God's Truth*; and to teach them to the People, as ſuch; and think fit to *Excommunicate* thoſe teaching the contrary, till they ſhall recant their Error. Of which ſee before, §. 200. Witneſs ſuch carriage of the *Synod* of *Dort* towards the *Remonſtrants*, who challenged the ſame exemption from their Tribunal, as they had done from that of *Trent*; but could not be heard.

|| *l.* 3. *c.* 13. *p.* 337.

As for that which follows, in *Anſwer* to D. *Arnauld*'s moſt rational challenging a ſubmiſſion, and Conformity, of ſo many *Proteſtants*, as have no certainty of their new Opinions, rather to the *Church*, than to Innovators, to me it ſounds thus. That every plain, and ſimple *Proteſtant*, 1ſt. Thinks his *Expoſition* or *ſenſe* of *Scripture*, in this Point of the Euchariſt, and ſo in others, any way neceſſary, to be *clear*, and without diſpute, [*and the more ſimple he is, the ſooner he may think ſo; becauſe he is not able to compare all other Texts, nor to examine the contrary ſenſes given by others, or the reaſonable grounds thereof.*] 2ly. Next, that every one, who thinks his Expoſition, or Senſe of Scripture clear in ſuch Point, is by this ſufficiently *aſſured*, that he hath a *right* Faith; or, from this *ſenſe* of his, knows *what he ought to believe, and forms a Judgment* herein *as certain, as if one had diſcuſſed all the Controverſies, one after another*: [a ſtrange propoſition; but I ſee nothing elſe, from which ſuch perſon collects his faith to be right; if any doth, produce it]. 3ly. That every ſuch ſimple perſon now eaſily knows, whether the Society, wherein he lives, be a true Church, or otherwiſe, *viz.* as they agree with, or diſſent from, that *right Faith* of his, already ſuppoſed; or as he finds them *to teach the things clearly contained in God's word*, *i. e.* in his clear Senſe thereof. 4ly. Knowing thus, from this

his

his clear exposition, or sense of Scripture, what he ought to believe, he needs not trouble himself, what the Ancient Church hath believed; [*which is very true:*] nay, he knows, without reading them, or M. *Arnauld*'s and M. *Claude*'s discourses upon them, that the *Fathers*, if of the number of the Faithful, were of his Opinion, by M. *Claude*'s arguing fore-mentioned. I desire the Reader to review his words, or, the 5th. and 6th. Chapters of his 1st. Book, and see if he can make any better construction of them. Now, if there be any Sense in this, he saith; How can he hinder, but that a simple *Catholick* may use the self-same Plea (*Church-Authority* being laid aside) for a certainty of his Faith upon the same pretentions, *viz. his clear sense* of *Scripture*, quite contrary to the *Protestants* clear sense? And, in any Controversie amongst *Protestants*: (Suppose that of the *Remonstrants* and *Anti-Remonstrants*,) here both sides have the same Plea, one against another; namely, the certainty of their Faith from their own Sense of the Scripture controverted between them. And, why doth not this certainty void their *Synods?* For M. *Claude* saith, —— *The word of God contains nettement and clairement, all that which is necessary to form our Faith, and that the most simple are capable to judge of it*, &c. Unless the *Protestant* Controversies be never about any thing *necessary*. This is the way M. *Claude* thought on to leave no *Doubters*, though never so unlearned, among *Protestants*, as to the Eucharist, or other Points of their Faith. But mean-while, if, after such Speculations of his, any such *Doubters* there be, I do not find, but that he leaves so many wholly to D. *Arnauld*'s disposal, *viz.* that they return to, and remain in, the bosome of the former Church so long, till they become certain of its errors; and not follow strangers that have not entred, by the door, into Christ's Fold; and, I hope, they will consider it. As for the *settling* of our *Conscience* this person speaks of, by resting our *Faith immediately* on *God's Word*, I see not, where the *sense* of the Scriptures is supposed the thing *controverted*, how any one rests his Faith more immediately on *God's Word*, by following *his own* Exposition or Sense thereof, or the Exposition of a *Minister*, &c. (for some persons exposition he must follow,) than he, that follows that of the *Church*.

If we are, then, for *a total application to the Scriptures*, and for *searching things to the bottom*; Let us search there first this main Point, (that decides all other) concerning our *Lord's* establishing a *just Church-Authority* for ending contentions. Where we shall find also; *that he is not a God of dissension*, or Confusion, 1 *Cor.*14.33 in his House, the Church; *but of Peace*. And, —— *That he hath given his* *Eph.*4.11.14 *Clergy* in a certain Subordination, *that We should not be carried about with every* 1 *Cor.*12.28 *wind of Doctrine*; as we must be, when ever these disagree in expounding Scripture to us, if we have no Rule, which of them to follow. The truth of this, once found out by our search, will save many other *searches*; of which, without it, I see no end. In vain do we endeavour, with what-ever pains, to discern God's Truth without the illumination of his Holy *Spirit* and *Grace*; and, since *revelat parvulis*, in vain expect this, without great *Humility*, and self-dis-esteem, and a reverent preference of, and pious Credulity toward our just, and lawful Spiritual Superiors. —— *Credendo*, first, [i. e. *Ecclesiæ*] † *c.* 1. saith S. *Austin* in his Tract *De utilitate Credendi* †, *præmunimur, & illuminaturo præparamur Deo.*

To

To resume then the matter we were speaking of before, from which we have so long digressed. For such Persons, as are self-confident, despisers of Superiors, much pre-engaged, whatever evident Testimony Truth may have on its side, I can affirm nothing; For Pride, and thinking they see, utterly put out their eyes. But I think, so many as are no way thus entangled, and are humble, and well-affected to Authority, will, by reading the pieces aforesaid, be reduced either to a full perswasion on the *Church's* side in this great Point; or to a *Dubitancy* and *uncertainty* of that, which is maintained against it. And then, this latter only (as hath been shewed †) is a sufficient Ground, and Inductive of their Conformity to it, I mean, to the *Authority* of the *present Church.* §. 321. *n.* 1. §. 321. *n.* 3. †§. 291, &c.

In this point, then, the main *Trial* seems to be, 1. Whether *Antiquity* indeed so understood, and *Council* declared, the *sense* of these Scriptures, as is pretended. Since, as Mr. *Thorndike* hath it; in his Rule of Reformation, † this is to be taken for granted, —— *That nothing can be the true sense of Scripture, which the consent of the whole Church contradicteth.* 2. If this found so; whether this *Authority* ought not to prescribe to any particular judgment; especially when he perceives, the new pretended *Demonstrations* to the contrary no way to perswade this present *Church-Authority*, as any true Demonstration (in the *Protestants* Definition of it) necessarily must. † *Forbearance and Penalties*, c. 8.

For the Second Point, *Invocation of Saints.*

1. It is granted by *Protestants*; that if the Saints *deceased* here, or otherwise know, our requests made to them, it is lawful to invocate them, or desire their prayers for us, as we do those of Saints *here*; and the invocation of them in any other manner the *Catholicks* disclaim. §. 322. *n.* 1.

2. It sufficiently appears, from the knowledge of things done, or ‖ said, † in absence, that several *Prophets*, and other *Saints* of God, by *Revelation* or *Vision* have had here in this life, that it is possible; that the Saints glorified, without imagining any their *omni-presence* or *omniscience*, may know, by the like *Revelation*, *Representation*, or *Vision*, or by some other way as God pleaseth, (for the particular manner thereof is no way stated by the *Church*) may, thus, know, I say, either *all*, or *so many* of those prayers, that are made to them (though at the *same* time, by *several* persons, in the most *distant* places) as it may concern their Petitioners, touching any benefit to be received by their Intercessions, that they should know them. Lastly, possible, that the Saints Glorified may know these, or some other instrument of God's mercy, *viz.* Angels, know these for them, or in their stead (for this clause also is put in by St. *Austin*, proceeding most cautiously in this matter). These things, I say, are possible: And if any of these be put, it is abundantly sufficient to render *Invocation* of *Saints* glorified not vain. For, to frustrate the benefit hereof, the *Saints* must neither know, nor *others* for them; who, only upon their general Intercession offered, may be, as God pleaseth, made his instruments in relieving the necessities of such Supplicants. They must neither know *all*, nor *any* of our affairs or prayers: For, if they, or others for them, only know and relieve some, it will be lawful, at any time, in any thing, to implore their help, who, we know ‖ 2 *King.* 5. 25. --- *Act.* 5. 3. --- *Col.* 2. 5. † 2 *King.* 6. 8, 9, 12, 31, 32.

not, but in that time, and thing, they may assist us. Again; suppose, neither the Saints, nor others for them, save God only, to know at all our particular prayers, or wants; but the Saints, only *in gross*, to intercede for all those, that implore their help; or, yet more generally, only for all their fellow-members here, that are in distress, whether imploring, or not imploring, their help; yet, if God, at least, apply the benefit of any Saints general Intercessions more particularly to those, who more particularly honour, and, with their addresses, solicite such a Saint; Such *Invocation*, and *Honour* still remains *profitable*, and advantageous to the Supplicant.

§. 322. *n.* 2. [Where note, that neither those, who make, nor yet God who reveals, their prayers to the Saints, do it at all for this end, that so the Saints may *make known* such their prayers to *God* (a thing in which Protestants please themselves to find absurdities and contradiction;) but, that these nearer *favourites* of *God*, and more powerful with him, may *obtain* from him (who knows all our prayers before we think them) the *grant* of those requests, which great *sinners* many times cannot. And out of *great mercy* to the Supplicants it is, that God *manifests* such their prayers to the Saints: much-what so, as he vouchsafed to direct *Jobs* three Friends to make their addresses to his Servant *Job*, to pray to Him for them, that so he might pardon them; because *Him he would accept*. † Or, as he spake to King *Abimeleck*, † whom he had smitten, that he should procure his Servant *Abrahams prayers*, to Him, that so he might heal him; for, how little will it differ from this, had God *revealed* to *Abraham* himself *Abimeleck*'s necessities, and willed him to *pray for* him; that so, upon his *intercessions*, he might heal him? So *God reveals Saul*'s prayers to *Ananias*, *Act.* 9. 11. And *Cornelius* his, to *Peter*, *Act.* 10. 19. both, in order to their assisting them. And why may not God *manifest* to his *Saints* the *necessities* of others, that, by thus occasioning their *Intercessions*, he may relieve them, as well, as God *manifest* to his Saints the *impenitency* of others, and so prohibit such their *Intercessions*, that he may punish them? As we find God speaking to *Moses*, —— † *Let me alone that mine anger may wax hot*, &c. And to the Prophet *Jeremy* † —— *Pray not thou for this people, neither make intercession to me, for I will not hear thee.* This to shew, that there is no *absurdity* in the former *possibilities*.]

† *Job* 42. 8.
† *Gen.* 20. 7.
† *Exo.* 32. 9.
† *Jer.* 7. 16.

§. 322. *n.* 3. Sufficient, I said, were any of the ways above-mentioned (and all *possible* enough) to render the supplicating of Saints deceased *not vain* and without effect. And so also, in *obtaining* the *benefit*, and *effect* of such supplications, it cannot be denied *possible*; that the Saint, that obtains it, may be also the Instrument in conveying it (and what *de facto* is done, I meddle not,) but yet this thing is no way *necessary*; no not, when the Supplicant, in any such supernatural effect, sees their *appearance*, or hears the sound of their *voice*. For such *Apparition* was that of *Ananias*, *Act.* 9. 12. who appeared, and spake to, and laid his hand on, S. *Paul* in a *vision*, when himself knew nothing of it. And such that of S. *Austin* † to *Paul* the Trembling Youth, and his Sister; and they hereby admonished, that they should repair to *Hippo*, where S. *Austin* was *Bishop*, for their Cure; where also both of them miraculously received it; and yet St. *Austin* saith †, —— *Apparui illis, nesciens.*

† *De Diverf. Serm.* 31, 22. and *De Civ. Dei. l.* 22. *c.* 8. † *Ibid.*

Illi

Illi enim me videbant, & ego nesciebam: & admonebantur, ut ad istam civitatem venirent. And such also his *appearance* to *Curma* (in that his strange *extasie* and peregrination out of his Body) seeming to baptize him; when he far distant (as he saith †) and busied in other affairs. And such that of S. *Ambrose* (at the discovery of the *Bodys* of the Martyrs, *Gervasius* and *Protasius*) his torturing of the Devils, who publickly confessed it, and beg'd his forbearance, —— *Illo aliud agente, atque hoc, cum ageretur, omnino nesciente*, as S. *Austin*, then himself at *Milan*, relates it. † Such *presence*, or *instrumency* of the *Saint* supplicated to, is not necessary for such effect; but it is sufficient, if this be done by the more ordinary, ministry of Angels: (And these, perhaps, sometimes representing the likeness of such Saints,) or yet some other way, as God pleaseth. And therefore may such appearances of a *Saint* be made, at the *same* time, in many places, without affirming the Saint's presence in *all*, or *any*, of them. This therefore in the second place, I presume to be put out of dispute, that all those things, that are *necessary* any way to render the *Invocation* of *Saints* glorified beneficial to their Clients, are *possible*: Possible, that they, or some other Instrument of the Divine Mercy for them, may hear, or otherwise know, our prayers; and may effect, or procure, the relief of our wants.

† *De Cura pro mort.* c. 12.

† *De Cura pro mort.* c. 17.

3. So that Thirdly. The only Question here is: Whether they, or some for them, *actually do so*: Because so general a practice may seem too rashly grounded upon a bare *possibility*. Now, this latter *Catholicks* affirm, from the much *experience* that the Church in all ages hath had of such their prayers, being frequently answered with *supernatural*, and *miraculous* effects. And it will be hard for any *Protestant* to deny this, who will take the pains to look into the *Ecclesiastical* Histories, or only to read over the 8th. Chapter of S. *Austin's* 22d. Book *De Civitate Dei*, and *Serm. De Diversis*, 31, 32. §. 322. *n.* 4.

In this *Point* then, the main *Trial* seems to be, concerning the pretended *experience* whether not *falsified?* Which Falsification, that *Protestant* would seem to have an hard forehead that would undertake to demonstrate, * against what occurs in all former *Church-History*, Ancient, Modern (and these so uniform, and like one another, both in the Devotions used, and favours received; no stranger relations in the latter, than the former; and these in both many times witnessed beyond all exception) Or even * against those particular relations only, fore-mentioned, in S. *Austin*.

For the Third Point: *Veneration of Images.* 1. The *use of* these *Images* *Protestants* allow: Nor, these to be removed for every abuse of, or scandal taken at, them (which *Puritans* do at those of *Protestants*). 2. For the *Veneration* of them; The Church's *Councils* have stated, That no *Latria* or Divine Worship may be given to any *Images*: but only such an inferior honour, and respect (and that too meerly for the *Exemplar's* sake) as to other *sacred utensils*, and also to the *name* of *Jesus* (at the last of which, when read, or heard, *Protestants* also bow). The *Council* of *Trent* (dispatching this Article concerning *Images*, as also some others, in some hast, so to conclude the *Council* before the much-feared death of the *Pope* then dangerously sick) refers us to the more full Declaration of the *Second Council of* §. 323. *n.* 1.

Nice, where this matter had been much examined. Now the *Definition* of that *Council* runs thus, —— *Definimus venerandas, & S. Imagines dedicandas, & in Templis Sanctis Dei Collocandas, habendasque: Quo scilicet, per hanc imaginum picturarum inspectionem, omnes, qui contemplantur, ad Prototyporum memoriam, & recordationem, & desiderium, veniant* [this for the lay ... of them] *Illisq; salutationem, & honorariam adorationem, exhibeant: Non secundum fidem nostram* [or, sicut fides nostra est] *veram latriam; quæ solum Divinæ naturæ competit; sed, quemadmodum typo venerandæ, & vivificantis Crucis, & sanctis Evangeliis, & reliquis sacris, oblationibus suffitorum, & luminarium, reverenter accedimus.* [Which last was then the general practice, as well of the *Iconoclasts*, as the *Catholicks*, nor any Controversie in those days concerning it]. Thus the *Seventh General Council*, whose whole business was the stating of this Question. And see the comparing of the *Honour* given to *Images* with that, to the *Name* of *Jesus*, in a Synod held at *Mentz*. A. D. 1549. since the Reformation, *c.* 41. in the larger Acts of it. † —— *Codicem oculis perlustrans, cum ad venerabile & tremendum nomen Jesu devenerit, caput aperit, & suspiciens in cœlum, oculos attollit: & ob id, omni reprehensione & Idololatriæ suspicione caret; siquidem non literas,* &c. *sic honorat; sed, cogitatione & veneratione mentis suæ, ad eum honorandum* [*i. e.* latria] *rapitur, cujus memoriam hæ literæ ei suggerunt. Cur ergo superstitionis, aut Idololatriæ reus peragitur, qui ante Imaginem crucifixi Domini caput aperit, aut procumbens adorat,* &c. And see *Vasquez*, who cites this Synod, thus entitling his, *Chapter* 11. *Disp.* 108. in 3. S. *Thom.* —— *Eodem modo atque Imagines, nomen Jesu, et alias res sacras* (naming, *Crucem, Vasa sacra, lib. Evangeliorum*) *esse adorandas.* And see *Suarez. Disput.* 54. §. 6. —— *Card. Lugo de Incarnatione. Disp.* 36. §. 6. saying the same. I have the rather mentioned here the reverence given at the name of *Jesus*, because, though that to the *sacred utensils*, and *Holy Gospels* is grown into desuetude among *Protestants*, yet this *other* is still retained.

† *Apud Vasquez in* 3. *Thom. Disp.* 108. *c.* 14.

When therefore we speak of that *Superior* Honour [*Latria*, or *Dulia*] that is given, or due, to the *Exemplar*, I mean either the internal honour of the *soul*, or also external of the *body*, for the *latria*, or *Divine* worship consists of both, and herein the external act receives its specification from the internal; and not one, but both these, we equally give to our Lord, then also, when we pray to him, not-before, or without, an Image; or, if you will, when, in the middle of our prayers, an Image is presented before us: I say, when this *Superior Worship* is spoken of, though here we uncover our Heads, we kneel before, kiss, and embrace, it; yet is the *Image* neither *Objectum*, nor *Ratio Adorationis*, but only *Adjunctum* (as the Cardinal hath it) *De Imag. l.* 2. *c.* 23. —— *Ipsa Imago nec est suppositum, quod adoratur, nec ratio adorationis, sed quiddam Adjunctum*, a *Circumstantial*, an *Inductive*, a Motive, thereof. For the mental intention here wholy directs (as it can at pleasure) to the *Prototype* these outward notes of Honour, some of which, as *kissing*, or *embracing*) are accidentally, and concomitantly, applied to the Image.

§. 323. *n.* 2.

Neither is such external *latrical* worship conveyed to the person represented, either by, or through the *Image*, as a *medium* to it: any way so to facilitate, or promote the acceptance of such worship, or ingratiate it with the

the *Prototype*: But the *Image* is a meer *circumstance* of such Adoration, as time, and place are, and any creature of God may be. Yet a *circumstance* very beneficial for reminding us of such duty, as also for rendring this service more fixt and steady; or intense, and devout. This for *worship* due to the *Prototype*.

Next, as for the *inferior relative* Veneration exhibited to their Images: *Catholicks* do not here pretend, or affirm, any *peculiar presence* of our Lord or his Saints, or any *vertue* either natural, or accessary and derivative, in any such Image, for which it should be worshipped, or honoured; or our *requests* to have any *more access*, or efficacy by, or through, any such Image, upon the *Exemplar*, or person represented; Or, again, the *Exemplar* any greater *influence* by, or through, it, upon those, who supplicate him before it (these are *Heathen* fancies derided by *Christians*); lastly, pretend no advantage in the use of such Images, either to render our *prayers*, or *worship* more acceptable to our Lord, or his Saints, or more effectual to us, save only, as the retaining such a grateful memory of our Lord, and his Saints, is conceived a thing well-pleasing to them: And, as the frequent beholding also such representations may excite, and increase our Devotion, Affection, Imitation, *&c.* and these again, performed, obtain a greater reward.

Things standing thus on the *Catholick* side, as most certainly they do, I ask, what *certainty*, or *demonstration* can a *Protestant* here produce of any other *error*, or *fault* in the Church; unless he will dispute here against, some *subtile expressions* of some *School-men*; or some *practice* of *rude* people: The first of which he is neither tied by the Church to *justifie*; nor the second, to *follow*. In this point, if any *trial* necessary, it seems to be: 1. Whether the *present Church* continue to teach, what the former hath defin'd? (For which see the late Council of *Trent* referring to that ancient one of *Nice*; and there the Church's doctrine sufficiently expressed in a very innocent stating of this point). 2. Whether the *practice* of some *ignorant* people in the Church be so faulty, as some would make it? And, if it be; 3. Whether the *Church*, teaching otherwise, be chargeable with it; or obliged to take away *Images*, for it? Lastly, if here a fault in the Church; 4. Whether a *Subject* of hers, obliged to nothing in this matter unlawful, may, for such her fault, quarrel with her, and *desert* her *Communion?* §. 323. *n.* 3.

§. 324.

For the Fourth; *Communion in one kind*. Here, since it is granted by *Protestants*, * † as also taken for a Principle by *Catholicks* ‡ That *Christ* is wholly and entirely contained, and exhibited in *either* species taken singly, and in every *least Particle* of *either* species; Christ's Body, Blood, Soul, Deity, suffering no more separation since his Resurrection; (so that none need fear the being deprived of our Lord's precious Blood by receiving only the Symbole of his Body); Since this, I say, is agreed on, The Question only is; Whether there be any absolute *Precept* in Scripture commanding, always, to all persons, the communicating in both kinds. Now *Catholicks* think this matter, that there is no such *precept*, sufficiently cleared by the practice of *Antiquity*, and the purest times: Which, on several occasions, gave it in *one kind* only; and this, when there was no case of absolute necessity to give

† See *Confess. Wittenberg.*---*Chamier. l.9.c.8.* --- *Confess. Protest. in the Diet at Ausburg.* 1530.

‡ *Conc. Trid. Sess. 21. cap. 3.* & *Can. 3.*

give it in one kind (but, then, always indeed ſome inconvenience in giving it in both; which is ſtill pretended, when the Church adminiſters it in one). Now ſuch practice could be in no times lawful, if there were a Divine Precept abſolutely, to all perſons, enjoining the contrary.

§. 325. But if ſuch univerſal precept there be, enjoining a neceſſary Communion of the *Cup*, [As; *Drink ye all of this*, Matt. 26. 27. ——— Or, *Do this in remembrance of me*, Luke 22. 19. ——— Or, *Except ye eat the fleſh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you*, John 6. 53. which is equivalent to this: *Let all thoſe eat my fleſh, and drink my blood, that will have life*], It ſeems moſt reaſonable, 1. That ſuch Precept be extended to all Communions whatever, as well thoſe private, or domeſtick, as, the publick (ſince in both poſſible to be obſerved). For there occurs nothing in our Lord's words diſtinguiſhing theſe Communions, one from another: or ordering a receit of the *Cup*, in the one, which ſhall be left at liberty in the other: And ſo by ſuch ſenſe of *Scripture*, as we have ſaid, the practice of *Antiquity* is condemned. 2. That it be extended, as to the receiving in *both* kinds, ſo to the receiving them *apart*, and to the drinking of the one, as the eating of the other: For the *Scripture* is no more expreſs for the receiving of the blood, than it is, for receiving it ſeparated by it ſelf, and for drinking of it: By which the practice of the *Eaſtern* Churches is condemned, who receive the Symbole of Chriſts *Body* only *intinct* in the *Blood*. 3. Eſpecially, from that Text in *John* 6. 53. That this *precept* be extended to *all* perſons for whom we expect eternal life: and ſo to Infants. Therefore the communicating of them alſo in both kinds, or one at leaſt, was a cuſtom uſed in Antiquity. Yet ſuch a *neceſſity*, by vertue of any Scripture-precept, *Proteſtants* together with *Catholicks* deny; and both deſiſt from ſuch a practice.

§. 326. Again, ſeveral other Texts we find in Scripture, that may ſeem to have the force of Univerſal Precepts, as much as any concerning communicating in both kinds; As *Act.* 15. 29. for *abſtaining from Blood, and things ſtrangled.* Luke 6. 30. ——— *Of him, that takes away your Goods, ask them not again,* ——— and, *Give to every one that asketh.* Matt. 6. 17. ——— *When you faſt, waſh your face, and anoint your head.* c. 5. 34. ——— *Swear not at all.* Matt. 23. 9. ——— *Call no man your Father on the earth; neither be you called Maſters* [The Quakers Precepts]. *Salute one another with a kiſs of charity, or an holy kiſs*, frequent in the Apoſtle, Rom. 16. 16. 1 Cor. 16. 20. —— 2 Cor. 13. 12. —— 1 Theſſ. 5. 26. *I have given you an example, that ye ſhould do, as I have done to you*, John 13. 14. [for the Clergies waſhing feet before the Communion] —— *Do this*, unlimited, in St. *Luke* 22. 19. for any Chriſtian whatever his *breaking bread*, or, *conſecrating*, and diſtributing the Communion. ——— *If any be ſick among you, let him call for the Elders of the Church: and let them pray over him, anointing him with oyl in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith ſhall ſave the ſick, and the Lord ſhall raiſe him up* [not, that every ſick perſon, that the Apoſtles prayed over, ſhould be cured]: *and, if he be in ſins they ſhall be forgiven him*, Jam. 5. 14. 15. urged as enjoining *extreme unction.*

Now,

Now, notwithſtanding the ſhew of *ſtrict* and *univerſal* Precepts, yet in the underſtanding and practiſing of all theſe, ſave the laſt, *Proteſtants* conform to the judgment of former, and preſent, Church. And in the laſt, though *Catholicks* think themſelves obliged to receive it, as a Precept; and, accordingly practice; yet *Proteſtants* deny the one, and forbear the other. §. 327.

Laſtly, ſome *Proteſtants* there be, and thoſe of note, that deny any peremptory *precept*, or command in Scripture, as in theſe, ſo in thoſe urged for *Communion ſub utraque ſpecie.* —— * *Ubi jubentur in Scripturis* (ſaith Biſhop *Montague* †) *Infantes baptizari? aut, Cœnam Domini, ſub utraque ſpecie communicantes, participare? Sexcenta ſunt ejuſmodi,* &c. —— *de quibus poſſumus profiteri: Nil tale docet Scriptura.* * Biſhop *White* on the Sabbath *p.* 97. —— *Genuine Traditions derived from the Apoſtolical times are received, and honoured by us: Now ſuch are theſe which follow. The hiſtorical Tradition concerning the numbers, and dignity of the Books of Canonical Scripture: The Catholick expoſition of many ſentences of holy Scripture* [Which indeed unleſs received, there will be no conviction or cure of *Hereſies*, and *Schiſms*]: *Baptiſm of Infants, obſervation of the Lord's day: The Service of the Church in a known tongue* [the tongues uſed by the Apoſtolical times for God's publick Service, the Church ſtill continues, unchanged]: *The delivering of the Holy Communion to the people in both kinds* [*i. e.* for *publick* Communions: For as for *private*, ancient Tradition many times practiſed otherwiſe]. * *Spalatenſis de Rep. Eccl. l.* 5. *c.* 6. *Dico, non eſſe adeo ſub præcepto, ut Euchariſtia et in cibo et in potu ſemper a fidelibus ſumatur, quin ex gravi, ſeu privata privatorum cauſa poſſit, cum fructu et licite, etiam ſub ſolo pane ſumi,* &c. And, indeed, in the *omnes* added to *Bibite*, *Matt.* 26. it ſeems clear, that our *Lord* had no particular intention, thereby to preſcribe, what *every* Chriſtian was *neceſſarily* to practice; becauſe the *Manducate*, as neceſſary as the *Bibite*, is pronounced without an *omnes*: But only to ſhew, what he would have to be done at that time by all the other Apoſtles, as well as by him, whom he firſt delivered the *Cup* to. For whereas ſeveral portions of the Bread were ſeverally given to every one of them: Yet the Cup was delivered only to one, from whom it was to be handed ſucceſſively to all the reſt, and divided amongſt them all. Therefore St. *Luke* inſtead of *omnes*, hath, *Take this, and divide it among your ſelves.*

† *Origin. Eccl. p.* 396.

In this point then, the main *Trial* ſeems to be: Whether *Antiquity* did, indeed, uſe ſuch a practice, as, on ſeveral occaſions where inconveniences happened of giving it in *both*, to communicate perſons in *one kind* only. Which if found true, it would be too great a temerity and boldneſs in a *Proteſtant* to alledge *certainty*, or pretend *Demonſtration* of the *ſenſe* of any Text of *Scripture* contrary to that, wherein both the preſent and ancient *Church* hath underſtood, and interpreted it. Eſpecially (as I ſaid) when theſe they ſtile *Demonſtrations* do not convince others, or, if, notwithſtanding this, they be good and ſufficient Demonſtrations, then muſt they be ſo too for many other *Texts* named before, as well as for theſe touching communion, to impoſe the ſame ſenſe, and univerſal preceptive force, on them: Yet, againſt which ſence, *Proteſtants* are neceſſitated to concur, in §. 328.

their

their judgment, with *Catholicks*; nay proceed further to deny some to be *Precepts*, which *Catholicks* accept for such.

§. 329. This Digression from §. 320. I have made, as hoping, it might be beneficial, to shew, in some *Controversies* of consequence, what small Foundation *Protestants* have to pretend *Certainty* and *Demonstration*, against the former *Church's* Doctrine. To which, in the last place, I may add, that such pretence of *Certainty* against *Church-Authority* suffers a great prejudice from that, which S. *Austin* hath observed; that it is a plea used by all *Heretick*s,

† *Enarrat. in Psal.* 8. ——— *Hoc faciunt* (saith he †) *Haretici universi*, ——— *vetant credere* [Ecclesia proponente] *incognita*; *& certam scientiam pollicentur.* And he

† *De utilitate Cred. c.* 1. saith, † that he was enticed by the Sect of the *Manichees* on this account, because they promised, ——— *Se, terribili authoritate separata, mera & simplici ratione* [or, as afterward, *magna quadam præsumptione, & pollicitatione, rationum*] *eos, qui se audire vellent, introducturos ad Deum, & errore omni liberaturos*: And, ——— *Se nullum premere ad fidem, nisi prius discussa & enodata*

† *Ibid. c.* 9. *veritate.* And again, ——— † *Eos Catholicam Ecclesiam eo maxime criminari, quod illis, qui ad eam veniunt, præcipitur, ut credant; se autem, non jugum credendi imponere, sed docendi fontem aperire, gloriari.* And therefore he saith in his *Retract. l.* 1. *c.* 14. That upon this he writ, against this presumption of theirs, his Book, *De utilitate Credendi*: Or, *Of the benefit of ones beleving Church-Authority.* This (from §. 318.) of the weak Grounds *Protestants* have of pretending *Certainty* against *Church-Authority.*

§. 330. 2. But next, Suppose a person may be infallibly certain of, and can truly demonstrate, something, the contrary of which *Church-Authority* delivers

* 2. as *certain*, yet if this certainty be only of such a Truth, from the knowledge of which ariseth no great *benefit* to Christians, or to the Church: or at least, not so much benefit, as, weighed in the ballance, will preponderate this other benefit of conserving the Church's peace. Here again these Demonstrators, *Protestants* also being Judges, are to yield to *Church-Authority* the obedience of *silence*, and *non-contradiction*: and are to keep such *Truth* to themselves; and not to disturb the publick peace, after any thing defined to the contrary, by divulging it to others.

§. 331. [In vindication of *such obedience*, thus Dr. *Potter*, ——— ‖ *It is true, when the Church hath declared her self in any matter of opinions, or of rites,*

‖ §. 4. p. 105. *her Declaration obligeth all her children to peace, and external obedience; nor is it fit or lawful for any private man to oppose his judgment to the publick.* Where he saith also, ——— *That, by his factiously opposing this his own judgment to the publick, he may become an Heretick in some degree, and* in foro exteriori, *though his opinion were true; and much more, if it be false.* After

† *Schism guarded, p.* 2. him Bishop *Bramhal*, thus, † ——— *That Church* [and much more that person] *which shall, not outwardly acquiesce, after a legal Determination, and cease to disturb Christian unity, though her judgment may be sound, her practice is schismatical.* And, Vindic. of Church of *England*, p. 27. ——— *When inferior Questions*, (saith he) *not fundamental, are once defined by a lawful General Council, all Christians, though they cannot assent in their judgements, are obli-*

obliged to passive obedience, to possess their souls in patience; and they, who shall oppose the Authority, and disturb the peace of the Church, deserve to be punished as Hereticks. Doctor *Fern, Division of Churches, p.* 81. requiring conformity of Sectaries to the Church of *England*, argues thus, *If Sectaries shall say to us: You allow us to use our Reason and Judgment in what you teach us: True, say we, for your own satisfaction: not to abuse it against the Church. But we do not abuse it, say they: But have consulted our Guides, and used all means we can for satisfaction. We tell them; You must bring evident Scripture, and Demonstration, against publick Authority of the Church: and* [next] *having modestly propounded it, attend the judgment thereof.* [But what if, after all, this go against them.] *To which if you cannot assent inwardly, yet yield an external peaceable subjection, so far as the matter questioned is capable of it.*] Thus he states the point.

Now, such an external peaceable subjection, and obedience (as hath been often said) if it were well observed, stops all *Reformations* as to these points, that are found of less consequence; the Demonstrators *Truth* must die with him: Nor, thus, will any Disciples be drawn from the *Church*, or their Pastors, to follow *Strangers*.

§. 332. Next; To know, whether the truth, they are so certain of, be also of so great weight, as that the Church's *peace*, and external *unity* is to be broken, rather than such a *Truth* strangled, or lost; what less thing also can secure them from this, that it is a Truth of much importance, than that, which secures them of their certainty, that it is a Truth, namely a *Demonstration* hereof. Now, the Evidences *Protestants* have brought either of the one, or the other; either, that such Church-Doctrines are *errors*; or, if so, errors of great *consequence*, have been heard and considered by *Church-Authority:* And these, by it, neither thought errors intolerable, nor errors at all. But, if *Church-Authority* may not interpose here, and every one may rely on his own particular Judgment, when truths, or errors, are of moment, when not; who is there, when his thoughts are wholly taken up with a thing, and he *totus in illo*, and perhaps, besides, troubled with an itch, that that knowledge of his, which he esteems extraordinary, should be communicated, and that *se scire hoc sciat alter*, who will not thus induce himself to think the smallest matters great? Lastly, concerning truths of much importance, let this also be considered: Whether that, which is so much pretended by the Reformed, that the Holy *Scriptures* are clear in all Divine Truths necessary, doth not strongly argue against them, that none of those things, wherein they gain-say the *Church*, are matters much important, or necessary: Because all these *Scriptures*, clear in necessaries, will surely be so to the *Church*, as well as to them: As they grant, these *Scriptures* to be *generally*, as to all persons, perspicuous, in all those common points of faith, that are not at all controverted.

§. 333. 3. But let this also be allowed: That the error of *Church-Authority* is not only manifest, but that it both is, and is certainly known to be, in a point most *important* and *necessary:* And that neither the obedience of *assent*, *3. nor yet of *silence*, or non-contradiction, ought to be yielded to *Church-Authority*

thority therein, yet all this granted will not justifie or secure any in their not yielding a third obedience, meerly *passive*, *viz.* a quiet submission to the Church's *censures*, however deemed in such a particular case unjust: Whereby, if this censure happen to be *Excommunication*, he is patiently to remain so (as who, in such case enjoys still the *internal* communion of the Church, though he want the *external*) till God provide for the vindication of Truth, and his Innocency: But, by no means, to proceed further to set up, or join himself to, an external communion *apart* and *separated* from that of his Superiors; and, such a communion as either refuseth any conjunction with them, or at least is prohibited, and excluded, by them; which must always be schismatical; as being that of a *Part* differing from the *Whole*; or, of Inferiors divided from their Canonical Superiors, by which now that Party begins to lose that *internal Communion* of the *Church* also, which, when unjustly excommunicated, and acquiescing therein, he still enjoyed. Of which persons, thus S. *Austin*, || —— *Sæpe finit divina Providentia expelli de congregatione Christiana etiam bonos viros; quam contumeliam vel injuriam suam cum patientissime pro ecclesiæ pace, tulerint, neque ullas novitates, vel schismatis* [*i. e. segregationis conventiculorum*, as he explains it afterward] *vel hæresis, moliti fuerint, docebunt homines, quam vero affectu, & quanta sinceritate charitatis. Deo serviendum sit.* —— *Hos coronat in occulto Pater, in occulto videns.* And, (*De Baptism. l.* 1. *c.* 17.) of such persons he saith, —— *Ibi magis probantur, quam si intus permaneant* [only with this exception] *Cum adversus ecclesiam nullatenus eriguntur, sed in solida unitatis petra, fortissima charitatis robore, radicantur.* Thus he in the defence of such.

|| *De vera Relig. c.* 6.

§. 334. But, If an *unjust* Excommunication should further warrant any to erect Anti-communions; and then, a private person may also pass sentence of such injustice, against the Church, who sees not, that this pulls down the whole structure of Church-Government, and fills it full of Schisms; and is the same in the Church, as this would be in the Civil State, if a Subject unjustly condemned to some mulct, or imprisonment, should presently raise, and head an Army against the Prince, and with it detain from him some part of his Dominions. No man is authorized, by *suffering* injustice, to *do* it.

§. 335. See, Christian Reader, how many bars are set to keep us within such a degree of subjection to the *Church*, as prevents *Schism*. 1. If we are of those, that do not profess *certainty* of the contrary to that which the *Church* teacheth (as the most of Christians are such) here *Protestants* || agree, that we owe the obedience of *assent*, and *submission* of *judgment* to the supremest known *Church-Authority*, that presides over us. 2. But next, Suppose we pretend certainty of a Truth against this Authority; yet, in case this truth be not of much concernment, Here *Protestants* || consent, that we are to yield the obedience of *silence*, and *non-contradiction* to it: 3. But, if the Truth be of moment; and so supposed, that neither *silence* may be used herein; yet are we still tied at least to yield a third sort of obedience, a

|| See §. 295.

|| See §. 331.

passive

paſſive one to the Church's *cenſures*, even to that of *Excommunication*, though ſuppoſed unjuſt, without erecting, or reſorting to, any Anti-Communion to that of our Superiors, and of the *whole*; *i. e.* the *Communion Catholick*: 4. And then, whatever degree of obedience a Perſon, well conſidering theſe things, ſhall judge due to be yielded to *Church-Authority in General*, I hope the former Diſcourſe, by clearing the Legality of, hath juſtly vindicated to, the *Council* of *Trent*. 5. And this *Council*, once ſubmitted to, infers, as to all the principal modern Controverſies, an univerſal Settlement and Peace. Now, the great Paſtor and Biſhop of Souls, in an acceptable time, bring home all thoſe Sheep that are yet going aſtray, and hearken to the voice of ſtrangers, into the happy Communion of all his Saints; That there may be *One* Fold, and *One* Shepherd, *Unus Dominus*, *Una Fides*, *Unum Corpus*. To Him All-powerful, and Good, and the conſtant lover of his Spouſe, *the Church*, be given all Glory, and Praiſe, in the ſame his Church, for ever. *Amen*.

1 *Pet.* 2. 25.

Joh. 10. 16.

Eph. 4. 5.

F I N I S.